

Doctor SHERLOCK's
CASES and LETTER

OF

Church-Communion

(Lately Summ'd up in the

Abridgment of the London Cases)

CONSIDER'D:

AND THE

DISSENTERS

VINDICATED

FROM THE

CHARGE

OF

SCHISM.

By NATHANAEL TAYLOR,
Minister of the Gospel.

LONDON: Printed for John Lawrence, at the
Angel in the Poultry. MDCCII.

a
c
n
t
h
h
t
h
n
S
d
l
r
a

th
g
h

T H E

P R E F A C E.

IT has been the avowed Design of several of our Clergy, for many Years, to represent the Protestant Dissenters as a Knot of desperate *Rebels*, and a Crew of wretched *Schismatics*; that so they might be thought worthy of nothing but the being *Hang'd* in this World, and *Damn'd* in the next. But there's none among 'em who has prosecuted both these bloody Charges against us with greater Heat and Vigour than Dr. *Sherlock*: So that one would imagine, the *Master of the Temple* had been instructed, by some ill-natured Members of that Honourable Society, in the Art of drawing up Indictments, managing Evidence, violently pleading against, and industriously running down, poor Innocent Men who are set to the Bar.

The First of these Accusations, *viz.* §. 1.
that of our being *Rebels*, has been
grounded upon this; That tho' they
have endeavour'd to cram it down our
A 2 Throats,

Serm. be-
fore the
Lords, Jan.
30. 1700.
on Titus
3. 1. pag.
20, 21.

Rights of
Convocat.
Edit. 1.
pag. 362.

Throats, yet for our Lives we could not swallow their Peculiar Doctrine of *Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance*, as they stated it, in all Cases whatsoever. The excellent Bishop of *Sarum* has, at last, found out some Measures of Obedience, tho' formerly it was as *Indefinite* as *Cartes's* World. His Grace of *York* has given this Point a new Turn, set another Face upon it, washt and colour'd it over: But with half an Eye any Man may see, that *his* well-guarded Notion of it is vastly different from what was so much cried up from the Pulpit and Press. Had it been as earnestly urged in 88, when the Prince of *Orange* was coming over, (which was the most proper Season for it, had it been *True*) and had the Nation believed it, and practised accordingly, we should have been long ere this in as wretched a Plight as the poor Hugonots and Catholick Slaves in *France*; without so much as the Name of a Protestant Church, or the Shadow of an English Parliament. But their profound Silence *Then*; the great Hand they had in bringing about the late happy Revolution, in which, if Dr. *Atterbury* may be believed, none were more *Instrumental* than *They*, which he pleads as a ground of Merit; their keeping a Day of *Thanksgiving*, for our Deliverance from Popery and Arbitrary

The Preface.

iii

trary Power, *Anno 1688*, and that of all the Days of the Year upon the 31th of January: All this makes me think the generality of Wise, Good and Learned Men among 'em, are sensible they had over-shot themselves; and therefore, I am willing (if I may be permitted) to forget to what an height of Extravagancy that Point, thro' humane Frailty, was carried by too many of 'em.

Nor would I have given Dr. *Sherlock* any trouble on *this Head*, but that he seems to me to bid publick Defiance to Repentance: For he has told the Nation in Print, that he *has renounc'd no Principle he ever taught in his Case of Resistance* Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers. In the Preface pag. 5. excepting this One; viz. That when *St. Paul* says All Power is of God, he means only Legal Powers; but that in an Hereditary Monarchy where the right Heir is living, Usurped Powers are not of God, nor the Ordinance of God. This, says he, is the only material Passage I know any Reason to retract in that Book.

Now among a great many others, there is one very Material Passage more, which I hope, upon Third Thoughts he will think fit to retract. 'Tis this, Were a Sovereign Prince the Peoples Creature, that might be a good Maxim, *Rex major singulis, sed minor Universis*, That the King is greater than any particular Subject,

*His Case
of Resist-
ance, &c.
pag. 104.
Edit. 2.*

but less than All together ; but if he be God's Minister, he is upon that account As MUCH GREATER THAN ALL AS GOD IS ; i. e. He is Infinitely Greater than all his Subjects, for so I take God to be. One would think so strange a Passage as this should never have dropt from so great a Divine ; or if it had slipt him, that when he had begun his Retraction, it would have been recalled by him. I doubt not but he looks on himself as God's Minister ; but whether he thinks himself on that account as much Greater than all the Private Gentlemen of the Temple, and all the People in the Nation, who are in no Divine Office, as GOD is, I leave the Reader to enquire.

Ib. p. 312. Another material Passage too he has in that Book which needs a Review ; viz. That Non-Resistance is certainly the Best way to prevent the Change of a Limited into an Absolute Monarchy ; Just as a Man's standing with his Fingers in his Mouth, or his Hands in his Pockets, is certainly the Best way to secure his Life and Money from all the Attempts of Thieves and Cut-throats. The Good People of England have tried another way, viz. By Soldiers, Swords and Guns, which by Experience they are convinc'd is certainly a better way than the Doctor's Non-Resistance, and plainly Contradictory to it.

Another

The Preface.

v

Another *material Passage* stands Unretracted in the same blessed Book, where-with he has for ever obliged his Native Country, *viz. A Monarch whose Power is limited and regulated by Laws*, (he must mean by the whole drift of his Discourse, tho he act never so Tyrannically and Cruelly, breaking down all the Legal Barriers before him like a Torrent) *is as Irresistible as the most Absolute Monarch, whose Will is his Law; and if he were not, I would venture to say, that the most Abso-* ^{Ib. p. 207.} *lute and Despotick Government, is more for the Publick Good than a limited Monarchy.* Sure the Doctor's bare-brain'd Loyalty is really what in their canting Abuse of Scripture, so many have told us that Rebellion is, *viz. as the Sin of Witchcraft.* For were not a Man possess'd by a very evil Spirit, he would never vomit up such vile Stuff as this is, much worse than Stones or crooked Pins; for these are Swords and Daggers, Bow-strings and Fetters, with *Jure Divino* impress'd upon 'em, to destroy the Constitution, and enslave the Nation. Tis not worth the while formally to confute so wild a Position as this. But seeing he is for *Venturing*, I could e'en wish he would venture over to little Master at St. Germans, where the empty Pockets, the meager Looks, and the Wooden Shoes of the wretched Inha-

bitants, would more effectually teach him what is for the *Publick Good* than Reasoning is like to do.

Once more; he says, *The Sovereign Power* (meaning the Prince in a limited Monarchy, without his Parliament, and in Defiance to the Constitution) *can repeal* Pag. 199. *Laws, and DISPENSE with 'em, and his Authority is Irresistible* in so doing. Lo! here's a fit Chaplain for our late set of Judges, whose Gospel is exactly suited to their Law. But I take it, that tis *High Treason* against our Constitution to set up *Tyranny*, as much as 'tis to set up a *Common-Wealth*; and *Plots* are not more dangerous than wicked *Principles* in either Case.

In short, 'tis plain by these Passages (which yet are not the only ones I could produce) that the Doctor can't defend his own Darling Doctrine, nor any longer Reproach us with *Rebellion*, without flying in the Face of the present Government, and undermining the very Foundations of the late most happy *Revolution*: Which can't be done with a good Grace at this time of Day. And therefore modest and prudent Men among 'em, if they have not changed their Sentiments; yet however bite in their Lips, hold their Tongues, and begin to let fall this severe Charge against us.

§. II. But

The Preface.

vii

§. II.

But tho' they are more silent in the Point of Rebellion against the State, than once they were; yet the cry of *Schism from the Church* is as hideous and loud as ever. We have been assaulted by the Bishops and Doctors of the Church on every side; as tho' they designed to overwhelm us with the *multitude* of their Books, if not with the *weight* of the Arguments contained in 'em. And I desire the Reader to observe, that *they*, tho' *unprovoked* by us, *began the War, de novo*, soon after the *Liberty*, and have continued from time to time to fire upon us, and batter us without intermission.

The *London Cases* against us were Reprinted, (at least Collected in *Quarto*) in the Year 85, at a Juncture when the whole Protestant Interest was in apparent danger; and therefore we were willing to put it up, rather than by an unseasonable Self-Defence contribute any thing towards the Common Ruin. Two other Editions there have been since that in *Folio*. Mr. Norris I know would look upon it as an Affront, if I should serve him as he has done his *Text*; and that is *forget* him: For Preaching on those words of our Saviour, *Blessed are the Peace-makers*, he falls a Quarrelling with us. This was followed with a Challenge in his *Charge of Schism continued* against
Disc. on the Beatitudes, p. 197.
us,

us, notwithstanding the Act of Indulgence newly granted us. Two great Men had wrote against him, whom I take to be the Learned Dr. *Whitby*, and the Ingenious Mr. *Lock*. He gently raps them up-

on the Fingers with * *Sanderſon's Logick*:
 But he unmercifully throws *Suarez de Legibus*, a considerable *Folio* at our Heads that he might be ſure to knock us down. We were not ſurprized nor much moved at this. For his new Abſtract of Divinity is one half ſhorter than our Saviour's. The Firſt Commandment, according to him, ſwallows up the ſecond: God alone muſt be loved, and † *not our Neighbour*, or any Creature whatſoever. I hope for the ſake of his Wife and Children, this Doctrine is not practiſed by him in his own Family.

* See Mr. Norris's Admonition concerning 2 late Books called Diſc. of the Love of God: At the End of his Practic. Diſc. V. 4. p. 369. † *Prac. Diſc.* Vol. 3. p. 10, 11, &c.

Biſhop *King* has ſnatcht the Sword out of our hands, and wounded us with our own Weapon; in a Diſcourſe about *Humane Inventions in the Worſhip of God*, writ with great Subtilty, but not with answerable Fairneſs.

The Learned Biſhop of *Salisbury*, as tho he had laid aſide his uſual Candor, ranks us with *Atheiſts*, *Socinians*, and *Papiſts*: Tho I believe he can't think we deſerve to be bound up in the ſame Bundle with them. His Grace of *York*, another very bright Ornament of the Church; and

The Preface.

ix

and the valuable Dr. *Lucas*, in their printed Volumes, begin with a Sermon about the *Unity of the Church*, wherein they are sure to condemn us as the only Breakers of it.

The *Snake* can't write against *Quakers* or *Deists*, but he spurts out his Poison upon us. The good Man is such a mighty Lover of Peace, that by all means there must be a Union with the *Papists*: *Case of the Regale and Pontificat. p. 247.* And is so extravagant as strongly to fancy our *English Convocation*, and the *General Assembly of the Clergy of the Gallican Church*, will shake Hands, cross the Seas, and lovingly embrace each other. I suppose he has had other Expectations from *France*, wherein he has been disappointed, as he has been, and will still be in this. He can swallow the *Pope's Supremacy* if it be a little garbled; tho' the Nation is sworn, and I suppose he himself has been so too, against a *Foreign Jurisdiction*. But *delenda est Carthago*; there's no Quarter to be given the *Protestant Dissenters*; nor is it possible there should be Peace with them. *ib. p. 264.*

The Minister of *Cirencester* falls upon us, and is led on by the good Bishop of *Gloucester*, who treats us as tho' his Lordship had forgotten what a *Latitudinarian* means, and that he himself had once been a Nonconformist.

In

The Preface.

In this Honourable Company I'll put Mr. *Dorrington* for old Acquaintance sake; on the Score whereof I will spare him, which is more than he deserves; for he has not only forsaken us, but gives us hard words on all Occasions.

The very *Dead* are inhumanely treated: Witness the Reflections on Mr. *Cornish*, his *Funeral* Sermon, and the Reverend, Pious and Moderate Comformist who Preach'd it. The Author of that Pamphlet might have shew'd more *Charity and good Manners*, seeing his own Church allowed the *Office of Burial* to be read over his *Corps*. And, by the way, I don't understand how they who write so severely against us, can say such kind things of us as are contained in that Office, when we are laid in the Grave. Mr. *Burscough* in a First, a Second, and a Third Book, endeavours to prove us Schismatics, and all our Pastors usurping Lay-Men in black Cloaths. To say nothing of his *Second*, Mr. *Smith* of *Dartmouth*, who picks a few Weeds out of a good Field of Corn, condemns a few unwary Passages in a large useful Book; and fastens his *black Teeth* on some that are justifiable enough. One *E. S.* who writes himself *D. D.* perfectly *crows* over us, and reckons he has so clear'd the Field that we shall never dare to shew our Heads any more, To make sure Work on't,

on't, out comes *Legion* too. For Mr. *Bennet* draws up the Divines of *London* in a Body against us in his *Abridgment*.

All this while we have stood, for the most part, like *Mutes*; so that the *Standers-by* are ready to pass the *Sentence* against us. Little, indeed too Little, has been wrote by Us, tho in a necessary Self-Defence. The *Champions* of the Church begin to reckon, they may as securely throw down the Gantlet and challenge us, as *Dimock* himself does all the World upon a *Coronation Day*.

Yea, we are *insulted* by their meanest *Scribblers* too. As tho the Correction of *Gentlemen* were not sufficient, we have been *Kickt by the Foot-men*. A Man of *Sense* would no more enter the Lists with such inconsiderable Wretches, than a Man of *Honour* would engage with the *Black-guard*.

But so loud is the Noise made by the foresaid Learned Men (and others too; for I han't mentioned all) that I could not but turn aside from other Business, and endeavour to repulse the strongest and fiercest of 'em. And is there not a Cause? Or must the *Dissenters* always carry it as tho there were a *mutual Change* of Principles between our Conformable Brethren and Us. They have indeed borrowed *our* Principles; else they could
never

never have assisted in the bringing about the late Revolution. I hope 'tis not expected We should take up *Theirs*, and fall in love with *Non-Resistance*. For my own part I am no great Admirer of their abundant Caution, who when they are attack'd on every side, will not stir Hand or Foot to ward off the Blow, for fear of straining a Sinew, cracking an Artery, or catching a Fall.

§. III. If any Man ask the Reason of my so Bold Undertaking, as to enter the Lists with this famous Author; my Reply in
Esther 7. *part is that of Queen Esther, We are sold to be destroyed, and to be slain and to perish,* and that in the worst manner, even in Hell for evermore. But as for the following words, were she living, I would ask Her Majesty's Pardon that I am not of Her mind: viz. *If we had been sold for Bond-men and Bond-women, I had held my Tongue.* She was a Foreigner, and bred in the Court of an Absolute Monarch, where profound Complements were all the Fashion; and might the more safely flatter him with her Words, whom for all his Greatness she could easily conquer by her Charms. For the Smiles of a beautiful Woman will presently overcome a wanton Tyrant: However Frown will make him lie prostrate
 at

at her Feet in as submissive and sneaking a manner as the meanest Vassal does at *His*.

But I was born and bred *inter Quatuor Maria*, I am a Native of *England*, and hope I shall always breathe here in the free and open Air of our present well-regulated Monarchy. If I can honestly help it, I'll never be a *Slave* to *Kyrk* or *Keysar*. 'Tis a much sorer Calamity to walk up and down in *Chains* during Life, than to be hung up in 'em after one's dead. Authors tell us, That *England* and *France* were formerly joined by a Neck of Land, which, God be thanked, has been broke a long while since. I hope it will never be made up again; but that at least the *Narrow Seas* will part the two Kingdoms.

Ahasuerus shewed great Indignation against the Author of the designed Mischief, and asked *Who he was*? He that does not remember, may peruse the Text, and find the Answer. 'Tis pardonable sure, if I have expressed a little Resentment against the Author of the *Case of Non-Resistance*; for I have a great Love for the *Liberties of Old England*, which that Book does totally undermine: And against the *Cases of Communion*; for I have an Affection for the Protestant *Dissenters*, who are a considerable number of Sober, Peaceable and Religious People, whom he would cast into Hell heaps upon heaps:
Or

Or if his Heart relent a little towards some *few* of them, when the kind *Fit* takes him; he has no Mercy for any of Us who are their Pastors and Teachers. He represents the whole Body of Non-conformists as Men *broke off from the Catholick Church; who have forfeited their Interest in the Covenant of Grace*, and are in as great danger of Perdition as moral Heathens. Yea, he insinuates as if many of 'em were *vile Hypocrites*, and all of 'em *e'en almost as bad as they who are guilty of Murder and Adultery*.

§. IV. What the Doctor has said to this purpose, Mr. Bennet has lately raked together, and made the 1st. Ch. of his *Abridgment*; that so by the murdering Shot play'd from this Battery he might *mow us down*, as the *French* boasted the *English* Ships lent them did the Hereticks at *Rochel*. I have therefore endeavoured to dismount this Canon, and nail it up in the ensuing Discourse. Wherein, tho I have referred in most places to the Doctor's *Cases* and *Letter*; yet I have, generally speaking, transcribed and followed the *Abridgment*; because the Author of it has in fewer words (and those too pickt out of the Doctor) summ'd up and laid all that he hath said in as much Order as it will bear: And I take it for granted,

ted, that the Doctor will own, he has *rightly* as well as *methodically* represented his Notions, and that too in their greatest Light and Strength; because there have been no less than 4 (if not 5) Editions of the *Abridgment*; and had there been any Failure, I presume the Doctor would have signified it to the humble Epitomizer, and he have done the same to the World.

But tho for the Reasons which I have just now mentioned, I have followed the *Abridgment*; yet I do not intend to have any thing further to do with the Author of it. 'Tis not his *Eccho*, but the *Doctor* himself (if he be at leisure) that I desire to Discourse withal. To whom I heartily wish a Christian Charity, equal to his other great Excellencies; and that he would no longer persist in his ill-natured Notions, lest he prove *Himself* a Schismatick, while he vainly attempts to prove others so; and like a furious Hearer of Wood, cut *Himself*, while he so eagerly lays about him with his Ax to chop *Us* off from the Body of Christ.

If any flaming hot Dissenter (for there §. V.
are *Bigots* of all Parties, and those I take to be the truest *Schismatics*; I say, if any such) shall revile me for maintaining the Controversy on Moderate and Catholic
lick

lick Principles ; I shan't be much surprized at it : For I know very well I am on the *Forlorn* ; and therefore suppose I may be shot in the *Back*, as well as cut in the *Face*. But let them, or some of their Friends, try what they can do, if they like not my Management. For a good Cause will no more *defend it self* than a strong Fortified Place will when assaulted by the Enemy, if there be no Garrison within, or the Soldiers be dead asleep. And if others see a Man (whose *Goodwill* however should be owned) ill treated by his Friends, they may be apt to be discouraged ; the natural Issue whereof is, they'll be tempted to lie still ; whereupon we shall be in danger of being *wrote out of the Field*, and *hooted* out of it too into the Bargain.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

INstances of our Author's Clearness. His Definition of a Church. The Impossibility there should be more Churches than One. His Argument to prove it. That all true Churches are Members of each other. Church-Communion is Church-Union. p. 1.

CHAP. II.

The Doctors Definition of a Church examin'd. No mention of Jesus Christ in it. If it be a true one, the Church of England is no true Church: Nor can there be any such thing as a true National, Metropolitan or Patriarchal Church: About which the Doctor greatly differs from Himself. p. 11.

CHAP. III.

The Churches Authority not allowed of Old. Dr. Smiths remarkable Publick Recantation for asserting it. Neither the Diffusive nor Representative Church has any. Our Convocation a meer Humane Constitution. Bp. Burnet's Account of it. The National Church no Political Society. Of its Constitutive Regent Head. p. 20.

CHAP. IV.

Some kind Passages to the Dissenters accidentally dropt, viz. That to be taken into Covenant with God, and to be received into the Church, are the same. That Baptism makes a Man a Member of the Catholick Church. That every Act of Communion, is an Act of Communion with the whole Church. That's a Sound Part of the Catholick Church, in whose Communion there is nothing Sinful. Whence our Author and his Brethren prov'd to be Schismaticks. p. 40.

CHAP. V.

The Doctors Three Rules to distinguish between Schismatical and other Churches have Two small Faults, viz. They are False and Useless. The first proved so, viz. That there must be
but

The CONTENTS.

but One Church in One Place, for one Church in the Bowels of another is horrid Schism. The French and Dutch Churches in England Consider'd. The Second and Third Rule no better than the First. p. 47.

CHAP. VI.

Of Occasional and Fixed Communion. The Doctors Mistake about the Nature of 'em. p. 71.

CHAP. VII.

Whether Constant Communion be a Duty, wherever Occasional Communion is Lawful. p. 77.

CHAP. VIII.

Though it should be supposed, that we are justly chargeable with Schism from the Church of England; yet we are not Schismatics from the Catholick Church: Proved by the Judgment and Reasons of the Greatest Divines of the Church: and among others of Dr. Sherlock himself. And by the Law of several Christian Emperors. p. 87.

CHAP. IX.

That we are not guilty of Schism from the Church of England. The Point stated. This inferr'd from the fore-going Chapter. The very hard Case of our Ministers, whom the People can't forsake without Sin. The Conformists gather'd Churches out of Churches. Our Departure not Voluntary; but We are forced away by their Canons. Of their Want of Discipline, and Opposition to it by a Prevailing Party among 'em. p. 100.

The CLOSE.

That we are bound to Communicate with a Church, that requires no Sinful Terms, not true, unless it be limited. The Argument from the Lawfulness of Occasional to the necessity of Constant Communion inverted, and thereby its Weakness shewn. It can hardly be thought our Brethren, when they Charge us with damning Schism, do believe Themselves. p. 125.

Dr. *SHERLOCK*'s
 CASES and LETTER
 OF
Church-Communion
 CONSIDERED, &c.

CHAP. I.

Instances of our Author's Clearness.

*His Definition of a Church. The
 Impossibility that there should be
 more Churches than One. His
 Arguments to prove it. That all
 True Churches are Members of
 each other. Church Communion
 Is Church Union.*

THIS Author promises very fair
 in the Beginning, *That he will
 Discourse on this Point with
 Clearness, and with (a) all possible Clear-* (a) Case p.
ness: But if there be no more of Strength 1. Abridg.
 B in p. 15.

in the other *Cases* than there is of Clearness in these, the *Dissenters* will be no more hurt by the *Doctor* or the *Abridgment*, than the poor naked Man in the Almanack by all the sharp Arrows, which are unmercifully stuck thro' his Joynts from Head to foot, but fetch not one drop of Blood from him.

§. 1. 'Tis a Rule universally receiv'd, that without first fixing the Signification of Words, which are used in different Senses, 'tis impossible to form a *clear* and *distinct* Idea of things in one's own mind, or convey it to another's: Which our Author hath wholly neglected; the unavoidable Consequence whereof is *gross* Confusion, *palpable* Darkness, and *perpetual* Self-Contradiction, spread throughout the whole of these *Cases*.

(a) *Case p.*
1. *Abridg.*
p. 15.

As an earnest of what we are to expect from him, he presently falls upon the *Defining of a Church*, (and that in a very *Lame Manner* too) before he distinguishes the various Significations of that Word, as apply'd to a Religious Society. *A Church*, says he (a), *is a Body or Society of Men separated from the rest of the World, and united to God and themselves by a Divine Covenant*. Thus he Defines it, without telling us before hand, (yea, or afterwards) whether he means the *Catholick*

Catholick Visible Church, or the Catholick Invisible One ; or a Patriarchal, National, Metropolitan, Provincial, Diocesan, Parochial, or Congregational Church ; or whether it be the Definition of a Church in the General Notion of it, and agreeing to *all* those sorts of Churches. This last, one would be inclin'd to suppose, is what he intends, because in the following Discourse he speaks much of the *Catholick Church* ; tho' the Title of this Chapter in the *Abridgment* is, *The Necessity of Living in Constant Communion with the Establish'd Church of England*, which is a *particular Church*. And the Design of the whole is to prove, that the *Dissenters*, by refusing to joyn in fixed stated Communion with the *Church of England*, cut themselves off from the *Catholick Church*, and forfeit their Interest in the Divine Covenant. And yet this *Clear Writer* never tells us what the *Catholick Church* is, nor what the *Church of England* is ; nor does he vouchsafe to inform us, wherein either one or the other of these are distinguish'd from a Church consider'd in the General Notion. Yea, one would think, that he deny'd that there were any *particular Church* at all ; for he often tells us (a), *There is but One Church* ; 'tis *One Body in opposition to many Bodies*. But how is it One ? Not in

(a) *Case*
p. 30. *A*
bridg. p.
15.

B 2

that

that sense wherein other Writers call it so;
but in a very singular way, peculiar to our

(a) *Case* Author : For he says (a), 'Tis extream-
p. 3. *A-* ly Absurd to say, that the Christian Church,
bridg. p. 16. which has the same Foundation, the same
Faith, the same Promises, the same
Priviledges, should be divided into
Separate Bodies of the same kind. And

(b) *Case* that (b) though the universal Church
p. 3. *A-* be divided into several Parts or Congregati-
bridg. p. 17. See ons, (mark his words, Parts or Congrega-
more to the tions, not Churches; for he adds) yet it
same pur- cannot be divided into Two or more
pose in the Churches. And yet he speaks (c) of the
Case p. 7. Church of Geneva, of France, and of

(c) *Case* p. 9. Abridg. England; and tells us (d), That two
p. 18. Churches may be in Communion with each
(d) *Case* p. 23. Abrid. other, and yet not actually Communicate
p. 21. with each other, because Distance of Place
will not permit it. And then I think if

both of 'em are Parts of the Universal
Church, the Universal Church seems at
least to be divided into two Churches;
and they are each of them Bodies of the
same kind, yea, and separate Bodies, i. e.
distinct ones, as being in Places very far
Distant from each other, and living un-
der very distinct Polities too.

This looks like gross Contradiction, to
say there can be but one Church, which
can't be divided into two or more Churches :
And yet to say that *de facto*, there are
two

two or more. Of which he can't clear himself, by saying, That when he affirms there is and can be but *one Church*, he means this of the *Catholick Church*: For then how Absurdly must he Talk, when he says, *The Universal Church can't be divided into two or more Churches*; i. e. The Universal Church can't be divided into two or more *Universal Churches*? yet sure it may be (for it actually is) divided into two and more *Particular Churches*.

'Tis very extraordinary to say *One Thing* can't be divided into *Two Wholes*. When any thing is divided into Two, 'tis wont to be divided into two Parts: But to divide a thing into *Two Wholes* is a very cunning Contrivance, near a-kin to what this Learned Doctor very Judiciously speaks of in one of his Books (a), viz. *Universal Parts*.

(a) Dr. Sherlock of the Nature, &c.

§ 2. But let us hear our *Casuist's* Proof of this Paradox: *It is*, says he (b), *extremely absurd to say that the Christian Church, which has the same Foundation, the same Faith, the same Promises, the same Priviledges, should be divided into separate Bodies of the same kind. For certainly where every thing is common, there is One Community. 'Tis true, distinct Men, though of the same Common Nature,*

of the Catholick Church, p. 32.
(b) Case p. 3. Abridg. p. 16.

have distinct Essences, and this makes them distinct Persons ; but where the very Essence of a Body or Society consists in having all things common, there can be but one Body. And therefore if one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, be common to the whole Christian Church, and if no Christian has any peculiar Priviledges, then there is but one Church. Hence 'tis plain, that according to our Author 'tis impossible there should be two or more Particular and Numerically distinct Churches: We must no more say, the Church of Geneva, the Church of Holland, the Church of Rome, and the Church of England ; for they are all but one Church, and cannot be so much as Numerically distinct from each other. For several Men, for instance, *Peter, James, and John*, are not specifically distinguish'd from each other ; for then all three of them could not be Men. But they are numerically distinguish'd from each other by a subtile Principle of Individuation, which has puzzled our Metaphysicians, and which our *Casnist* calls *Essences distinct from the Common Nature* ; without which these Men could not be *Three*. But the Church of Geneva, of Holland, of Rome, and of England, according to our Author, have not so much as this ; indeed have nothing at all to distinguish them

them from each other ; they have *all things common* ; they have no peculiar Priviledges, and therefore they are and can be but *one Church*.

But by this Learned Doctor's good leave, there are many things whereby particular Churches are distinguish'd from one another ; I shall name but one, and that is, their *Ecclesiastical Polity*, whereby they are united otherwise than the Universal Church as such, is or can be. Some are united under the Pope, others under Diocesan Bishops, and others under meer Presbyters. And so they are *more* distinguish'd from each other than 3 Men : For though *Peter, James and John* are distinguish'd, as our Author words it, by their *distinct Essences*, yet these Essences are only *numerically* distinct : Whereas the afore-mention'd *particular Churches* are distinguish'd by *Polities*, which are *specifically* distinct from each other. For I take the Pope, a Diocesan Bishop, and meer Presbyters to be specifically distinct Governours, as much as Tyranny, Kingship and Aristocracy are Governments specifically distinct.

Now after all that he saith here for *One* ^{(a) *Vindic.*} Church only, yet elsewhere (a) he has ^{of *Dr. Stillingfleet* p. 164, 165.} discover'd *Two Universal Visible Churches* ; one consisting of all those Christi- ^{as quoted in *Mr. Baxt. Cath. Com.*} ans and Churches who profess the true ^{def. p. 33.} Faith

‘ Faith of Christ, observe his Laws and
 ‘ Institutions, and live in Communion and
 ‘ Fellowship with each other; and the o-
 ‘ ther contains the Conventicles of Here-
 ‘ ticks and Schismatics; which are a mid-
 ‘ dle Thing between the *true Catholick*
 ‘ *Church* and the World of *Infidels*; as *Re-*
 ‘ *bels* in a Kingdom. So that Christ has
 two Bodies; one that is united to him,
 and another that is *not* united either to
 him as the Head, or to that which is his
 True Body. Which looks like a very
great Mystery indeed.

(a) Letter to Anonymus in Answer to his 3 Letters to Dr. Sherlock about Church Communion, p. 14. Abridg. p. 21. §. 3. Our *Casnist* further tells us (a),
That all true Churches are Members of each other.

Now I think he himself will not say,
 that the Church of *England* is a Member
 of the Church of *Geneva*, or of that of
France, or of that of *Holland*; nor that
 either of them are Members of the *Church*
 of *England*. A Man who writes with a
 design to be understood, would have ex-
 pressed it thus: They are all *Members of*
the Catholick Church, not *Members of each*
other; as the Eye, the Foot, the Hand
 are Members of the Body, not of each o-
 ther; for sure the Eye is no Member of
 the Foot, nor are Head and Hand Mem-
 bers of each other.

Nor can I imagine what should induce our *Casnist* to say, That all true Churches are *Members of each other* ; unless it be, that we read in our English Bibles, *We being many are one Body in Christ, and every one Members one of another*, Rom. 12. 5. But this, as we have rendred it, is an obscure Expression ; the Apostle can mean but this, That we are all *joynt Members* ; not *Members one of another*, but of *the same Body*, as having a common Relation to one and the same Head, and a mutual Relation to each other. Had our Author consulted some Learned Commentators on the place, he might have been informed this was the meaning of that Phrase, and he himself would have so worded it *.

§. 4. Another Instance of our Author's *Clearness* we have in this Position of his (a), *That Church-Communion is* (a) *Casep. Church-Union*. I suppose the Reason of ^{10. Abrid.} this must be, because *Communion is Uni-* ^{p. 18.} *on* ; for otherwise the Addition of the word *Church* would not make that a true Proposition. Now this is to make a gross Tautology of the very Title of two of his

* *Dixit ἀλλήλων μέλη, & hic, & Eph. 4. 25. Sicut Latine dicimus Civis meus, municeps meus, de iis qui nobiscum ejusdem sunt Civitatis aut Municipii. Grot. in Locum.*

(b) *Case p.*
 11. *Abrid.*
 p. 18.

his own Books, viz. his Two Treatises concerning *Union and Communion with Christ*; i. e. concerning *Union and Union with Christ*; for one is t'other, *Communion is Union*. And when he plays the *Casnist*, he speaks of an (b) *Exercise of Communion*; now an *Exercise of Union* sounds very harsh. And, says he, *though a Man that is in Union or Communion with the Church, should perform those Offices, &c.* i. e. A Man that is in *Union or in Union with the Church*. Another Man would have thought, that *Union is a Means* pre-requisite in order to *Communion*, or the necessary Foundation of it. But our Author has a more sublime way of Writing than so: *Communion is Union*; if it be, 'tis by the same extraordinary Figure, whereby the End is the Means, the Superstructure is the Foundation, and the Top stands for the Bottom.

But I should never have done, if I should pretend to insist on all the blind Passages in this Author, whose whole Discourse is like the Flames of that Infernal Pit into which he casts us Dissenters by whole-sale, where Heat and Darkness always dwell together.

No wonder the *Abridger* writes after this Perplext and Intricate Rate, tho' he was then a *Fellow* of a Colledge in *Cambridge*;

bridge; and therefore should have had those Rules fresh in his Mind, which, thro' a long Absence from the University, may have slipt the Doctor's Memory. But this *Infant Author* can suck no other Milk, how thick soever it be, than what he finds ready prepar'd for him in that Breast to which he lays his young and tender Mouth.

CHAP. II.

The Doctor's Definition of a Church examin'd. No mention of Jesus Christ in it. If it be a True One, the Church of England is no True Church: Nor can there be any such thing as a True National, Metropolitan or Patriarchal Church: About which the Doctor greatly differs from Himself.

I Now proceed to examine the Doctor's Definition of a Church: 'Tis this (a), *A Church is a Body, or Society of Men separated from the rest of the World, and united to God and to Themselves by a* ^{(a) Case p. 1. Abridg. p. 15.} *Divine Covenant. United to themselves, is one of our Casuist's peculiar Strains:*

I suppose he means united to *each other*. So Plain People are wont to **express** it, when they speak or write of several Persons being united in one Society. But I have greater Faults to find with this Definition : For

1. Here is no mention of Jesus Christ in it : Nor in the after *Explications* in the *Abridgment*, but only once in this Occasional Passage, viz. *The Christian Church*

(a) *Abridg.* (a) *is nothing else but such a Society of Men as are in Covenant with God through Christ.*
p. 16.

I am glad to find his Name any where. But sure it ought to have been in the *Definition of a Church* : Especially if that be

Discourse of the Nat. Unity and Communi- true which Dr. Sherlock says elsewhere, that since there is no other Head of Unity for the Church but Christ, the Formal Reason of the son of this Unity must consist in the Union of the whole Church to Christ, which makes the Universal Church the one Body of Christ.
p. 13.

And again, How is the whole Church but One Body? Truly I know no other way but that they are all united to Christ in the same Covenant ; and all who are thus united to Him, Christ accounts His one Body. He

(b) *Ibid.* tells us (b), That no Ecclesiastical Ministers or Pastors belong to the Definition of the Catholick Church. They have no reason to take this ill, for he does not deal worse by them than he doth by our Blessed
p. 32. and again to the same purpose, p. 37, 38.

fed

fed Saviour, for He also is left out of the Definition. Nor have the Dissenters any great Cause to repine, that our Author thrusts Them out of the Church: For I think 'tis no great Injury to be turn'd out of that Church from which Christ himself is excluded; and excluded he is out of the *Casnist's* Definition of it; and Definitions should contain every thing that is Essential in them. Sure I am, St. Paul, when he was writing of the Church, thought our Blessed Saviour so necessary, that he calls the Church by His Name: *For as the Body is One*, saith he, 1 Cor. 12. 12, 13. *and hath many Members, and all the Members of that One Body being many are One Body; so also is CHRIST: i. e. the Church.*

2. If our Author's Definition be true, the Church of *England* is no true Church; nor can there be any such thing as a true National, Metropolitan or Patriarchal Church. For a Church is, according to him, a Society of Men united to God and to themselves by a *Divine Covenant*. Now he tells us afterward (a), *That this is the Chief thing to be observ'd.* And he (b) *supposes that all Men grant, that God only can make a Church; and that the only visible way he has of forming a Church, is by granting a Church Covenant, which is the*
(a) Case p. 4. Abridg. p. 16.
(b) Case p. 5. Abridg. p. 16.
Divine

(c) *Case p. 5. Abridg. p. 17.* *Divine Charter whereon the Church is founded. And a little after he adds (c), that no Church-state can depend upon Humane Contracts and Covenants; and therefore the Independent Church-Covenant between Pastor and People is no part of the Christian Church-Covenant, because it is no part of the Baptismal Vow, which is one and the same for All Mankind, and the only Covenant which Christ has made.*

*Dr. Still-
ingfleet
Unr. of
Separ. p.
299.*

Now, according to this Account, the National Church of England cannot be a true Church: For that is either the *Diffusive*, or the *Representative* One. The *Diffusive* National Church of England is the whole Body of Christians in this Nation, consisting of Pastors and People agreeing in that Faith, Government and Worship, which are established by the *Laws of this Realm*. Here is a *Humane* Consent of Pastors and People; and here are the *Laws* of this Realm, which are the cement of their Church; but I take neither their Consent nor our Laws to be a *Divine* or the *Baptismal Covenant*. Here are Pastors and People, here are King, Lords and Commons to make a Church, which must be a *Humane* Creature; not a true Church, for that *God only* can make, and I don't take any of them to be *God*. The Consent of the one, and the Laws of the other, are no more a part of
of

of the *Christian Church-Covenant*, and of the *Baptismal Vow*, than any *Independent Church-Covenant* whatsoever.

The *Representative National Church* Dr. Still-
 ' of *England*, is the *Bishops* and *Presbyters* lingfleet
 ' of this *Church*, meeting according to the of the Unr.
 ' *Laws of the Realm*, to Consult and Ad-of Separ.
 ' vise about Matters of Religion. Now p. 300.
 how come the *Bishops* and *Presbyters* of
 this *Church* to be a *National Church*? 'Tis
 not by a Divine Charter, but by the *Laws*
 of this *Realm*: Not by God's Appoint-
 ment, who alone can make a Church:
 Not by vertue of the *Baptismal Vow* which
 is the only *Covenant* *Christ* has made. For
 I don't take the *Laws* of this *Realm* to be
 any part of the *Baptismal Vow* and Co-
 venant. That, as he says (a), is one and (a) Case p.
 the same for all *Mankind*. Now I don't 6,7. Abrid.
 think that all *Mankind* have or pretend p. 17.
 to a *Right* to sit in the *Convocation*; or
 that all *Mankind* is bound to observe the
Laws of this *Realm*, tho' they are bound
 to consent to the *Baptismal Covenant*
 when 'tis proposed to them.

Nor is a *Metropolitan* or *Patriarchal Church* a true Church, according to this
Definition. To clear this, let us hear a lit-
 tle what the Learned *Dr. Sherlock* himself Dr. Sher-
 saith in his other Writings; speaking of a locks Vind.
Bishop's being the Highest Governour in of some
 his own Church, he say *Nor does this* Protest.
Principles,
 over-pag. 21.

overthrow that Ancient Constitution of Patriarchal or Metropolitan Churches. For a Patriarch or Metropolitan was not a Superior Order to Bishops, nor included any Authority over them, as is evident from what St. Cyprian discours'd, who was himself a Primate : But only some Precedency in the same Order, and such Advantages of Power in the Government of the Church as was given them by the Common Consent of Bishops for the greater Publick Good. A little after, he ascribes their Authority to the

Ib. p. 73. Canons of the Church, and the Laws of the Land by which they are confirmed. So that the Metropolitan and Patriarchal Churches, by his own Confession, are not founded on a Divine Charter, are not constituted by the Baptismal Vow ; but formed by the Common Consent of Bishops, the Canons of the Church, and Laws of the Land. They depend entirely upon Humane Contracts and Covenants, and are not Churches of God's making, and therefore are no true ones ; for Men may as soon make a World as a Church. We are sure God only can do the former ; and our Author takes it to be a Point bright as Light it self, that all Men will grant He only can do the latter. For, as he adds

Case p. 5. in the Case, such Persons (if there were any so Absurd) are not worth Disputing with, who dare affirm the Church to be a Humane

Humane Creature, or the Invention of Men.

I have found one so *Absurd*, even the Doctor himself; and was just a going to lay aside my Pen, and write no more against a Man, who, himself tells me, is not *worth Disputing with*: Which, if he may be believ'd, will further appear from the following Passages. For, speaking of the Combination of Churches for Catholick Communion, he says (a), (a) Ib.

There is no Arch-Bishop, no Primate, no P. 45.

particular Forms of Combinations of Churches of DIVINE Institution: (b) What (b) Ib.

ever Superiority or Jurisdiction Arch-Bi- P. 71.

shops challenge over Bishops, 'tis but a HUMAN Institution

Again, — They must quit all (c) Pretence to a Divine (c) Ib.

Right, and confess the Pope to be as very a Humane Creature as the Arch-Bishop is.

And the Archiepiscopal and Patriarchal Authority (d) were not Instituted by Christ. And (d) Ib.

that which gives (e) Being to a National (e) Ib.

Primacy, is not the Institution of Christ, P. 74.

but the Authority of Sovereign Princes and Civil Powers.

And once more (f), Arch- (f) Ib.

Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Prebends, Ca- P. 113.

nons, Arch-Deacons, Chancellours, Officials, Priests and Deacons; this is only an

Ecclesiastical Body of Humane Institution for the good Government and Discipline of such combined Churches, and alterable

C

again

overthrow that Ancient Constitution of Patriarchal or Metropolitan Churches. For a Patriarch or Metropolitan was not a Superior Order to Bishops, nor included any Authority over them, as is evident from what St. Cyprian discours'd, who was himself a Primate : But only some Precedency in the same Order, and such Advantages of Power in the Government of the Church as was given them by the Common Consent of Bishops for the greater Publick Good. A little after, he ascribes their Authority to the

Id. p. 73. Canons of the Church, and the Laws of the Land by which they are confirmed. So that the Metropolitan and Patriarchal Churches, by his own Confession, are not founded on a Divine Charter, are not constituted by the Baptismal Vow ; but formed by the Common Consent of Bishops, the Canons of the Church, and Laws of the Land. They depend entirely upon Humane Contracts and Covenants, and are not Churches of God's making, and therefore are no true ones ; for Men may as soon make a World as a Church. We are sure God only can do the former ; and our Author takes it to be a Point bright as Light it self, that all Men will grant He only can do the latter. For, as he adds

Case p. 5. in the Case, such Persons (if there were any so Absurd) are not worth Disputing with, who dare affirm the Church to be a Humane

Humane Creature, or the Invention of Men.

I have found one so *Absurd*, even the Doctor himself; and was just a going to lay aside my Pen, and write no more against a Man, who, himself tells me, is not *worth Disputing with*: Which, if he may be believ'd, will further appear from the following Passages. For, speaking of the Combination of Churches for Catholick Communion, he says (a), (a) Ib. *There is no Arch-Bishop, no Primate, no particular Forms of Combinations of Churches of DIVINE Institution*: (b) *What ever Superiority or Jurisdiction Arch-Bishops challenge over Bishops, 'tis but a HUMANE Institution* Again, — *They must quit all* (c) *Pretence to a Divine Right, and confess the Pope to be as very a Humane Creature as the Arch-Bishop is. And the Archiepiscopal and Patriarchal Authority* (d) *were not Instituted by Christ. And that which gives* (e) *Being to a National Primacy, is not the Institution of Christ, but the Authority of Sovereign Princes and Civil Powers.* And once more (f), *Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Prebends, Canonons, Arch-Deacons, Chancellours, Officials, Priests and Deacons; this is only an Ecclesiastical Body of Humane Institution for the good Government and Discipline of such combined Churches, and alterable*

C

again

again as the *Necessities of the Church* require.

By the way ; I had thought tho' *Deacons* may pass for *Cyphers*, yet that *Priests* or *Bishops* at least had been our *Governours* by *Divine* Institution, and not a *Humane* one ; and *unalterably* so too. But to let that pass as a Slip. Here we have as full a *Confession* as need to be desired, that all beyond a *Diocesan Church*, all *Combinations of Churches* into *Provincial*, *Metropolitan*, or *National*, and particularly the *Church of England*, and all *Arch-Bishops*, *Deans*, *Prebends*, *Canons*, *Arch-Deacons*, *Chancellours*, *Officials*, and the long &c. of

(a) *Canon the (a) rest that bear Office in the same,*
the 7th. stand upon no *Divine Bottom*, are not founded on a *Divine Covenant*, are not of *God's making* but of *Man's*, are not united together by the *Christian-Church-Covenant* and the *Baptismal Vow*, which is the only *Covenant* *Christ* has made ; but depend upon *Humane Contracts and Covenants*, which no *Church-state* can do, if our *Casuiſt* may be believ'd. And yet this same *Learned Man* at other times
Summary of Controv. p 123. tells us, That *Metropolitans* and *Patriarchs* is a very useful *Constitution*, and of great *Antiquity in the Church*, if it had not its *Beginning in the Apostles Times*. And
more

more plainly elsewhere (b), *When Christ* ^{(b) Def. of}
hath instituted a Catholick Church, and ^{Dr. Stil-}
Catholick Unity, it seems strange to me, that ^{ingf. pag. 259.}
a National or Patriarchal Church, (which
is only such a Combination of several Churches
into one, as may serve the Ends of
Catholick Unity) should not be thought as
much a Divine Institution as any particular
Church. But 'tis not more usual for
the Thames to Ebb and Flow, than for
him to assert This and That : And as he
says of Mr. Baxter (c), he has very often ^{(c) Ib.}
been a Schismatick to himself, and very sel- ^{P. 85.}
dom agrees long together with his own Judg-
ment.

CHAP. III.

The Churches Authority not allow'd of Old. Dr. Smith's remarkable Publick Recantation for asserting it. Neither the Diffusive nor Representative Church has any. Our Convocation a meer Humane Constitution; Bp. Burnet's Account of it. The National Church no Political Society. Of its Constitutive Regent Head.

THE better to Confound the Dissenters, they are often put in mind of the *Churches Authority*. Our Casuist tells us (a) of the *Necessity of Obedience* to it. That (b) every *National Church* has Authority over her own Members to prescribe the Rules of Worship. And that each Church has a peculiar Jurisdiction. So great Weight upon all Occasions is laid on this, that I must a little enquire into it. And

(a) *Abridg.*
p. 19.
(b) *Dr. Sherlock's*
Lett. to A-
nonymus,
&c. p. 14.
Abridg. p.
20. 21.

I. These Lofty Strains are hardly of any earlier Date than the Days of King James the First. Before that time, they who vented 'em have been severely Scourg'd

Scourged for it; witness the Recantation which Dr. *Smith* was obliged to make in K. *Edward* the Sixth's Reign, a printed Copy whereof I have now before me, which is a great Rarity, the least Hint whereof I could not meet with in Dr. *Burnet's History of the Reformation*. The Title of the Book the Reader may see in the Margent, which I give him exactly according to the Print and Spelling of those Days; as I shall the following Quotations, *Viz.* That where-

as he had wrote, ' That Men
' ought to obey the Byf-
' shoppes Commaundement
' in all thyngs leasful upon
' payne of everlastyng Dam-
' nacyon ——— and that it is
' more convenient that the
' People obey their Byf-
' shoppes Commaundements
' and Decrees although it be
' but in a thyng *Indifferent*
' of it self, and not com-
' maunded by God, than that
' Servants should obey their Masters or
' Children their Fathers and Mothers.
' ——— And that as Subjects be bound to
' obey and fulfyll their Princes Lawes
' which are not conteyned in God's
' Lawes beyng not against it; even so be

A GODLY AND
Faythfull Retraſtation
made and published at
Paules Crosse in Lon-
don the Yeare of our
Lorde God 1547. the
15 Daye of May. By
Mayſter Richard Smyth
Doctōr of Divinity and
Reader of the Kyngeſ
Majeſtyes Lecture in
Oxford. Revokynge
therein certeyn Errours
and Faultes by him com-
mityd in ſome of hys
Books. Londini. Anno
Domini MDXLVII.

‘ Christen People bound to obey and
 ‘ doe that which their Bysshoppes bid-
 ‘ deth them doe: All these Sayinges I
 ‘ doe now Revoke, Dilanull and Con-
 ‘ dempne as Erronious and False. Then
 he professes First, ‘ That the Auctorite
 ‘ of Bysshoppes and other call’d the Mi-
 ‘ nisters of the Church consisteth in the
 ‘ Dispensacion and Ministracion of
 ‘ God’s Woorde; and not in making
 ‘ Lawes, Ordinaunces and Decrees over
 ‘ the People *befsyde God’s Worde* without
 ‘ the Consent and Auctorite of the Prince
 ‘ and People. Secondly, That no Byf-
 ‘ shop nor none of the Clergie assembled
 ‘ together have any Auctorite to make a-
 ‘ ny Lawes or Decrees *befsydes God’s*
 ‘ *Law* over the People without the Con-
 ‘ sent of the Princes and the People;
 ‘ and if they do make anye suche, no
 ‘ Man is bounde to obey them. Third-
 ‘ ly, That in those Countreyes where by
 ‘ the Auctorite of the Prince they have
 ‘ made anye suche Lawes, the auctorite of
 ‘ those Lawes doth not appende and
 ‘ hang of the Bishhops and the Cler-
 ‘ gy, but of the Princes and Cheif Heds
 ‘ in every Country. Fourthly, That
 ‘ within this Realme of *England* and o-
 ‘ ther the Kinges Dominions there is no
 ‘ Lawe, Decree, Ordinaunce or Consti-
 ‘ tution

' tution Ecclesiastical in force and avail-
 ' able by any Man's auctority, but only
 ' by the Kynges Majestyes auctority or
 ' of his Parliament. Afterwards speak-
 ing of Rites, Canons, and Ceremonies
 he says, ' The Kynges Majestie for the
 ' tyme beyng, may either of laful or
 ' just Cause, or of his mere Goodnesse
 ' without any cause, dispence or ab-
 ' solve any Man from beyng bound to
 ' them. And the sayd Persone with
 ' whom the Superior Powers have di-
 ' spensed withall and so made free from
 ' them (*ex. gr. the Dissenters since the*
Act of Indulgence) may use his sayd
 ' Lybertie without any daunger of Synne
 ' or scruple of Conscience. —He adds,
 ' If any Man hereafter (which God for-
 ' byd) should preach, teach, or set forth
 ' any thing which is not consonant and
 ' agreying to these aforesaid Articles and
 ' Assertions (as they who now talk of
 the Churches Authority and Jurisdiction)
 ' beleue good Hearers and know you
 ' surely, that it is a false, untrew, and
 ' devellysh Doctrine, and ungodlye U-
 ' surpation upon the Holly Scripture,
 ' contrary too the trew, pure and catho-
 ' licall Doctrine of Christes Church.

2. This National Church, that pre-
 tends to so much *Authority* and *Jurisdiction*

on, must be either the *Diffusive* one, which is the Body of the People of *England*; or the *Representative* one, which is the Bishops and Presbyters of this Church met in Convocation.

I suppose they will not say 'tis the Church *Diffusive*; for this would be to make the *People* the Fountain of Ecclesiastical Authority and Jurisdiction; and lift up the Multitude into the Saddle, who are the Persons to be Govern'd.

And that the Church *Representative* has no Authority and Jurisdiction, I will labour to prove by these following Considerations.

1st, Because in despite of the 139th Canon Dr. *Sherlock* hath taught us to affirm, That the *Convocation* neither *is* nor *can be* the Church *Representative*, tho' it be so call'd. For we may argue with reference to the *National Church of England Diffusive*, as he does with reference to

(a) *Disc. of the Nature, Unity and Communion of the Catholick Church* p. 36. the *Catholick Church*. As (a) Bishops, says he, are not the *Catholick Church*, so neither are they the *Representatives* of the *Catholick Church*. So say I, as *Bishops* (and take in Presbyters too if you will, or those chosen and deputed by 'em) are not the *Church of England Diffusive*, or the *Body of the English People*; so neither are they their *Representatives*.

sentatives. For the Office of a Bishop (as he goes on) is not to Represent, but to Govern the Church; and therefore Bishops are not the Churches Representatives by Institution, no more than the King is the Representative of his Kingdom. How then do they come to be the Churches Representatives? Did all the Christians in the World (says he) who are the Catholick Church (Did all the Christians in England, say I, who are the Church of England Diffusive) ever intrust them with this Power? Did they ever resign up their Faith (saith he; and their Christian Liberties say I) into the Hands of their Bishops? This never was done; and yet no Man has a Representative but by his own consent. And if it could be done, Bishops then must sit in Council (so he, in Convocation say I) not only as Bishops, but as Lay-Representatives, if two such Different Capacities are not Inconsistent.

Again, in another (a) Place, in answer to this Question, Cannot the Catholick Church meet and act by its Representatives, as Kingdoms and Common-Wealths do? He replies, I have already proved, that all the Bishops of the Church, much less any one Bishop, cannot represent the Catholick Church: No, nor the Diffusive National Church of England, say I. For as
(a) Ib. p. 44.
Bishops

Bishops they are not the Church, but the Governours of it under Christ; and no Man ever yet thought of any other Representatives for the Church. How the Lower House of Convocation will like this, who are one Half of our National Church Representative, and not one Bishop among them, but all of 'em Presbyters, I can't tell. But let us hear him proceed; And

(a) Ib. *it is (a) evident, de facto, that there are no other Representatives; for the whole Multitude of Christians never did make choice of any such Representatives; and no Man can be represented but by his own consent. And if there could be any such Representatives made by the Unanimous Vote of all the Christians in the World (saith he, in England say I) which I think is morally impossible, yet then the highest and most Sovereign Authority in the Church would be derived from the People, which I suppose the Church of Rome (saith he, the Bishops and Presbyters of England, say I) will not very well like.*

This is a Notable Flight, but he rises
(b) Ib. *higher than this: For, as he goes on (b), indeed it is absolutely Impossible that the Catholick Church should be represented (so he, and with the same Reason the Diffusive Church of England, say I) For the Catholick Church (and 'tis the same as to the*

the Diffusive Church of England) is the whole Multitude of Christians (add to our present purpose, in England) Now a Multitude as a Multitude can never be represented by any thing but it self: There can be no Formal nor Virtual Multitude, but the whole entire Number. The Catholick Church, as he adds (a). signifies All (a) Ib. Christians; and if you leave out any of the P. 45. Number, it is not All, and therefore is not the Catholick Church. — The Catholick Church cannot be represented by a Few of the whole Number; because a Few are not All; and therefore not the Catholick Church. So say I, the Diffusive National Church of England signifies all Christians in England; and if you leave out any of the Number, it is not all, and therefore is not the Church of England. So that the Church of England cannot be represented by a Few of the whole Number, because a Few are not All, and therefore not the Church of England.

It is not my Business to examine whether All these Arguments of his are Conclusive; I leave that to Him; He is the more oblig'd to make 'em good, because he seems to value Himself mightily on this Book of His, whence I have gathered these choice Flowers: As appears by these words of His towards the close of the

the Preface, *Viz.* ‘ After all that is said
 ‘ on one side and t’other, I am very sen-
 ‘ sible there never will be an End of these
 ‘ Wranglings without settling the true
 ‘ Notion of the Catholick Church,
 ‘ which, tho’ a great many good things
 ‘ have been said about it, I think was
 ‘ never thoroughly done yet. What my
 ‘ present Performance is, I must leave
 ‘ other Men to judge: But if my Notion
 ‘ be right, I am sure there’s an End
 ‘ of all the Vain and Arrogant Pretences
 ‘ of the Church of *Rome*. I should be
 glad also if he would tell us, whether
 the Convocation be the *Representative of*
the Parliament too: And to shew where-
 in lies the *Power* of the Church of *Eng-*
land, of which they make so great a
 Noise, tho’ the Church has been so much
 under the King’s Girdle ever since *Henry*
 the Eighth’s Days, that the Convocation
 dare not so much as to Debate any Mat-
 ter without His Majesty’s License, for
 fear of a *Premunire*; of which we have
 a late Instance in the Case of *Toland’s* He-
 retical Book; and what Resolutions so-
 ever they come to, yet they do not oblige
 our Consciences but by vertue of His
 Majesty’s Ratification of ’em by His Au-
 thority; without which they signify no
 more than many Contracts written on
 Paper that wants the Royal Stamp.

2dly,

2dly, I argue this from the odd Constitution of this which they call the Church Representative. Here I will use the Words of Bp. Burnet, whereby the Reader will better understand this Mystery of the Representative Church of *England*, for Separation from which we must be Damn'd. — This may be

‘ very Positively affirm’d, That in no
 ‘ part of the Antient Constitution, and
 ‘ in no Church for many Ages after the
 ‘ Primitive Times, can it be made appear,
 ‘ even by a Conjecture, that in any National or Provincial Synod the Inferior
 ‘ Clergy form’d a Body apart, and sate
 ‘ by themselves without their Bishops;
 ‘ acting in any sort as a Co-ordinate
 ‘ Body with them. So that whatsoever
 ‘ may be found of this kind among us is
 ‘ no part of our Ecclesiastical Constitution as we have an Authority from
 ‘ Christ, that ought to be manag’d conformably to the Primitive Pattern, but
 ‘ is *meerly a Temporal Constitution* taken
 ‘ from the Frame of our Parliaments.
 ‘ Therefore, if Men have a true Zeal for
 ‘ the Primitive Times, they should turn
 ‘ it all another way, to procure a Constitution suitable to that Frame. The
 ‘ Commons of the Spirituality sate in a
 ‘ Chamber apart, as the Commons of the
 Tem-

The Bishop of Sarum's Reflections on a Book concerning the Rights of an English Convocation,
 p. 9. 10.

‘ Temporality did ; and were summon’d
 ‘ by the same Authority and to the same
 ‘ End. But tho’ with Relation to the
 ‘ Temporal Concerns of the Clergy, this
 ‘ was a good Constitution, yet it cannot
 ‘ be call’d a *true Representative of the*
 ‘ *Church*, tho’ it be now a *Legal* one. In
 ‘ the Lower House there are of the Pro-
 ‘ vince of *Canterbury* 20 *Deans* or more,
 ‘ who pretend to sit there ; there are as
 ‘ many Proctors from Chapters, and 60
 ‘ *Arch-Deacons*, and but 38 *Clerks*, cho-
 ‘ sen by the Clergy. So that the Deans
 ‘ and Chapters who had their Authority
 ‘ at first by *Papal Bulls*, and have now
 ‘ their Exemptions and Jurisdictions
 ‘ continu’d to them *only* by a Proviso in
 ‘ the Statute of 25. *Hen.* 8. have more
 ‘ Interest in the Convocation than the
 ‘ whole Body of the Clergy. These are
 ‘ all made either by the King or by the
 ‘ Bishops. The Threescore *Arch-Dea-*
 ‘ *cons* are all of the Bishop’s Nomination,
 ‘ and their Authority is of a *Late Date*,
 ‘ and but a *Humane Constitution*. All this
 ‘ is besides the Interest that the Bishops
 ‘ have in making the Returns of Two
 ‘ only out of all those who are chosen
 ‘ in the several Arch-Deaconries of their
 ‘ Diocess ; so that the Inferior Clergy
 ‘ can in no sort be said to be equally *Repre-*
 ‘ *sented*

‘ *sented* there. Much less can this be said of the good People of *England*. Here are 20 Deans and 20 Proctors from Chapters, and 60 Arch-Deacons, *i. e.* No less than a Hundred who are no Officers of Christ, whose first Original was from the Pope, and the continuance of them only from a Statute, to 38 Clerks chosen by the Clergy. And out of all those that are chosen in their several Arch-Deaconries, the two that are to be return’d are chosen by the Bishops, which Bishops too are chosen not by the Church unless in Mockery, but by the King. Now is not here an admirable *Church Representative*, founded on a *Divine Covenant*? And I wonder who ’tis that the 60 Arch-Deacons do represent.

His Lordship goes on: ‘ I acknowledge this (*Viz. an Equal Representative of the Inferior Clergy*) is not necessary in a Constitution, that pretends no higher than *Law and Custom*; a Practice past Prescription is, in such Cases, a good Foundation; and if Men rise no higher in their Claim for Church-Power than *Law and Custom*, this is enough: But if they pretend to a *Divine Original*, they must seek for another Constitution. Indeed, if they are

‘ con-

‘ contented to take up with a *Humane*
 ‘ *Authority*, they may rest satisfy’d with
 ‘ this.

p. 11, 12. His Lordship further goes on to the
Deans, and other exempted Persons ex-
 exercising all the Acts of Episcopal Jurisdi-
 ction, and then adds these very observa-
 ble words, *Viz.* ‘ If Ecclesiastical Au-
 ‘ thority is only of Humane Original,
 ‘ indeed all this may be excused and born
 ‘ with : But if our Plea for a Divine O-
 ‘ riginal is well founded, then, since no
 ‘ Humane Law nor Custom can derogate
 ‘ from the Divine Law, let those who are
 ‘ concerned in these things see how they
 ‘ can reconcile our Principles to their
 ‘ Practises. Here are Presbyters acting
 ‘ in most parts of the Episcopal Functi-
 ‘ ons, as Bishops, without any Subordi-
 ‘ nation to them : If all is founded on a
 ‘ Divine Right, then by the same Autho-
 ‘ rity that they do invade many Acts of
 ‘ Episcopal Jurisdiction, they might as
 ‘ well have invaded all the rest : And if
 ‘ the one would be condemned as a Sa-
 ‘ crilegious Attempt, it will not be easy
 ‘ to excuse, much less to justify the
 ‘ other.

A little after he adds ; ‘ It is not very
 ‘ fairly done to bring some Authorities
 ‘ from Ancient Authors and Councils,
 ‘ of

‘ of Presbyters assisting their Bishops,
 ‘ and from thence immediately to con-
 ‘ clude for the Right of a *Convocation*
 ‘ constituted as ours is.

To which I'll add one Passage more, *p. 13.*
Viz. ‘ The Debates with the Puritans and
 ‘ the Disciplinarian Controversy, was
 ‘ that which occasion'd great Heats du-
 ‘ ring Q. *Elizabeth's* Reign. But the Con-
 ‘ vocation never meddled with this; it
 ‘ was left wholly with the Queen; she
 ‘ appointed some Bishops, and others of
 ‘ the Clergy who were of the High Com-
 ‘ mission to settle Rules in those Mat-
 ‘ ters. They did it. — So here a Mat-
 ‘ ter of very great Consequence was set-
 ‘ tled by a few Bishops and others, acting
 ‘ by the Queen's Commission; and this
 ‘ was the Rule that the Church was go-
 ‘ vern'd by, 'till the late Civil Wars.
 ‘ Here was a good Plea for the Puritans,
 ‘ which this Author has found out for
 ‘ them, that none of themselves made
 ‘ use of.

3. Dr. *Sherlock* tells us, That the Bishops
 when assembled together have no Go-
 verning Power at all. (And I suppose
 the addition of Presbyters to 'em when
 met in a Convocation, will not give 'em
 any Authority.) They can only *Con-*
sult and *Advise*: They meet only for *Ad-*

(a) *Vind. of Protest. Principles.* *vice* (a) *and Counsel, not for Rule and Empire,* as he tells us over and over. And p. 20. 27. *Bishops, faith he* (b), *as to Subjection are* 37. 41. *Independent; for there is no Superior Authority in the Church over them, as I have*

(b) *See his Disc. of the Unity of the Church.* *always asserted.* (So did Dr. Barrow (b) also before him.) And consequently that which they call the *Church Representative* has no Authority, either over the Laity of a National Church, or over any Particular Bishop. Yea, the Doctor carries the Matter so high, as not only to destroy the Power of the National Church, but even His Majesty's Authority also in Ecclesiastical Affairs: For he calls the Bishop the *Supreme Ruler* many Scores of times. And let us see what Prerogatives he invests him withal. *Every Bishop, according to him, as being the*

(c) *Vind. of some Prot. Principles,* (c) *SUPREME Governour of his own Church and Diocess, has Authority to appoint the decent Rites of Worship in it.* p. 101. *Again, Every Bishop hath an Original Right to do This, i. e. to determine the Decencies and Order in Ceremonies in his own Church. And tho' it be most Uni-*

(d) p. 103. *form* (d) *that a National Church should use and more the same Liturgy, yet if every Bishop, who to the same purpose is the SUPREME Governour of his* p. 104. *own Church, should have a Liturgy of his own, I see no Hurt in it, provided it be a true*

true Christian Liturgy, and neither corrupt the true Christian Faith nor Worship. 'Tis hard to reconcile this with his other Assertion, *That every particular National Church has Authority over her own Members to prescribe the Rules of Worship.* The Sovereign Authority of the Bishop in each Diocess, who is the Supreme Governour, does (if any thing) oblige the People; not the Authority of the *National Church*. But after all, the determining Decencies in Order and Ceremonies, and Rites of Worship, and appointing what Liturgy shall be used, are Matters which *His Majesty, as Supreme Head of the Church*, does pretend unto. And the *Lay Chancellour* has the Keys hung at his Girdle, who can not only controule the Bishop, but huff and hector him too: Of which we have two very remarkable Instances, one in (a) *Duke the Chancellour's Carriage towards the Bishop of Wells*; the other in the Case of the excellent (b) *Bishop Bedell*.

(a) *Naked Truth* p. 64.

(b) *Bp. Bedell's Life written by*

Bp. Burnet p. 88. 89.

So that here are four Steps, one higher than the other, and yet each of 'em the Highest of all. Here's the Bishop, who is the Supreme Governour: The Lay-Chancellour, who can check and controule him: And the National Church, that must be Superiour to both; and His

Majesty, who as the Head of the *Church*, is above all of 'em.

4. If the National Church has Authority and Jurisdiction over us, she must be a true Political Society; otherwise, she is only a *Community* of Men, who voluntarily confederate together, who may make Contracts which will oblige those who do consent, but none besides: As a company of Merchants, agreeing to Trade together to such a Place in a joynt Stock. But such a Community can't properly make Laws, and can exercise no Jurisdiction.

If she be a true Political Society, she must have a Constitutive Regent Head. This indeed Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, and after him Dr. *Sherlock* his Vindicator, pleads is not necessary in order to make her a true Church, because the Church-Catholick is a true Church without any such Head. But by the Leave of these Learned Men, I think the Church-Catholick has a Head, *Viz.* Our Lord *Jesus Christ*; and he has given Laws to the Catholick Church; He is its Governour, and all its Members are Govern'd by Him. And of all Men

(a) *His* living Dr. *Sherlock* (a) should not deny
Disc. of this, because he will *allow* no other Union
Union and but a *Political* one only between Christ
Communi- and His Members.
on, &c.

The

The True Reason why they say there neither is, nor is there any necessity that there should be a Supreme Head and Governour of this National Church, is, Because they are at a Loss to tell us who he is. The Difficulty here is the same as it was lately in a very Famous Instance, about the *Vacancy of the Throne*. If it be not vacant, 'tis fill'd up; but who is it fill'd up with? So in our present Case, *Who* is the Supreme Head and Governour of this Church? The Arch-Bishops, one or both? Or is it His Majesty? This is a puzzling Question; and therefore they are forc'd to say, that this Body, as such a Body, as the Church of *England*, has no Head at all. But then how comes this Church to have so much Authority, and talk so high of her Jurisdiction, and make *Canons* which all English Men are bound to obey? Yea, what is the Principle of Unity, and how comes she to be One Church? They tell us, 'tis by *Unity of Consent, as all Particular Churches make one Catholick Church*. But by Unity of Consent (a) to what? If it be not to one Common Government, it is not a Govern'd Church as one. And does not the Catholick Church consent to one Governing Head, *Viz. Jesus Christ*? And does any thing else make her formally one Politick Body or Church?

D. Stillingfleet's
Unr. of
Separ. p.
299.

(a) Mr.
Baxter's
2d Reply to
Dr. Stillingfleet.

Well, but it is One National Church, because it was receiv'd by the *Common Consent of the whole Nation in Parliament, as all other Laws of the Nation are.* But yet still, as Mr. Baxter observes, the Question remains unanswer'd, *What is the one Common Governing Power in the Church which this Parliament consent hath* ^{Boyle's} *set up?* Besides, this is not a Combina- ^{Vind. Cal-} *tion purely Ecclesiastical and Intrinfecal,* ^{vin. p. 4.} but Civil and Extrinfecal.

And an Act of Parliament is no *Divine Covenant*, nor is it the *Baptismal Vow*, in whole or in part, which *alone can constitute a Church*, as our Casuist tells us, and we have before observed.

The plain Truth of the Case is, the King and Parliament are the Makers, and the Head of the Church of *England*; and I think they have a just Power to rule their own Creature: And our Convocation in the True Notion of it are but their Ecclesiastical *Council*. Now, King, Lords and Commons have granted us an Act of Toleration; and the Collection of all the Churches, whether Conformists or Nonconformists, are the Church of *England*, united under one Civil Government. Our Conformable Brethren indeed are the Church *Triumphant*: they have the Temples, and the Tythes, and
other

other large Revenues, by the Law of the Land : We live by the voluntary Contributions of our People, which we have a Right to in the General only by the Law of God. They are as the Elder Sister, who has a large Fortune : we like the Younger Ones, who are not so kindly dealt with ; but we neither *envy* nor *murmur* ; we only *plead*, that meerly because we are poor we should not be called Bastards, and as such kickt out of the Family. Authority has made them a Church ; but the same Authority has given us a Permission to form our selves into Churches : So that we stand on the same Ground, tho' not on the Level with them. And the Cry of the Churches Jurisdiction and Authority over us, and of Rebellion against her, is quite turn'd out of Doors.

CHAP. IV.

Some kind Passages to the Dissenters accidentally dropt. That to be taken into Covenant with God, and to be receiv'd into the Church are the same. That Baptism makes a Man a Member of the Catholick Church. That every Aēt of Communion is an Aēt of Communion with the whole Church. That's a Sound Part of the Catholick Church in whose Communion there is nothing Sinful; Whence our Author and his Brethren prov'd to be Schismaticks.

I Shall now proceed to a Point that will not a little surprize my Reader, and that is, some Lucid Intervals, some very sober and kind Passages, with reference to the Dissenters, which our Author hath accidentally let fall in the midst of all his sharp Reflections upon 'em : As

First, That to be taken into Covenant with God, and to be receiv'd into the Church,

Church, is the same thing: (a) And so ^{(a) Case p. 6. Abridg. p. 17.} are a Covenant-state and a Church-state.

That every professed Christian, who is received into the Covenant as such, is a Church Member. And that nothing else is necessary to make us Members of the Christian Church but Baptism, which gives us Right to all the Priviledges of the Covenant. And a little after, That Baptism (b) makes us Members of the Universal ^{(b) Case p. 8. Abridg. p. 19.} Church, because it admits us into the Covenant which God has made with the Universal Church.

Now we have never yet understood, that our Brethren of the Church of England have question'd the Matter of Fact whether we were Baptiz'd; nor the Validity of our Baptism neither, except Mr. Dodwel, and a few of his Bigotted Temper, who by this time may have as ill an Opinion of the Sacraments administred by those who succeed our Abdicated, Deprived Bishops and Presbyters. For if *They* be Usurpers, these flaming Gentlemen will say their Acts are invalid. But we find no Article, Rubrick, or Canon of the Church of England, which declares the Baptism administred and receiv'd among the Dissenters, to be a Nullity. If there were, I suppose they would have insisted upon it, that those

Dis-

Dissenters who have had Occasional Communion with 'em, or have wholly left us and gone over to *Them*, should be Baptiz'd by the Parish Ministers, before they were admitted to the Lord's Supper: Which certainly they would, if they looked on them as Unbaptized Persons and Heathens, and no Members of the Catholick Church 'till they came among them. Now seeing we have been Baptiz'd, and our Baptism is valid, even by the Acknowledgment of our Brethren themselves, and nothing but Baptism is necessary to make us Members of the Christian Church, we undoubtedly are Members of it; for we have not yet renounced our Baptism, nor the Covenant seal'd thereby; and we hope, by the Grace of God, we never shall. We have been admitted by this Ordinance into the Common Gospel Covenant, we are under the Baptismal Vow, which, as our Casuist tells us, *is one and the same for all Mankind*: And we hope we need not laboriously prove we are a part of *Mankind*. We are Members of the *Christian Church*, and tho' we are not Members of the *Church Establish'd by Law*, that is not so very material; that don't thrust us out of the *Catholick Church*; for as our Casuist tells us (a), *No Church State can depend*

(a) *Case p.*
6. *Abridg.*
p. 17.

depend on Humane Contracts and Covenants. And as for any other Covenant besides the Baptismal One made with the Catholick Church, 'tis none of God's making. For God hath not made a Particular Covenant, saith he (a), with the Church of Geneva, France or England, but with the One Catholick Church. Indeed he tells us (b), We can't Preserve our Church-state without Actual Communion. The Truth of this we need not enquire into, tho' it will admit of a Debate: For to use his own Words elsewhere (c), We visibly receive the Eucharist our selves, and perform our Solemn Devotions in Publick Assemblies; and this is to Communicate with the whole Christian Church in the same Sacraments and Worship. Which leads me to,

Secondly, Another kind Saying which he has dropt as an Inference from his foregoing Discourse, Viz. That Church Communion principally respects, not a Particular, but the Universal Church, which is but One all the World over.---That every Act of Christian Communion, such as Praying, &c. is an Act of Communion with the whole Catholick Church, tho' it must be perform'd in a Particular Congregation, because all Christians cannot meet in one place. Thus do we as Fellow Members pray

(a) Case p. 9. Abrid. p. 18.

(b) Abridg. p. 25.

(c) Summary of the Controversies, &c. p. 129.

(d) Case p. 13. Abrid. p. 19.

Case p. 14. 15. Abrid. p. 19.

pray to God the Common Father of Christians, in the Name of Christ the Common Saviour of Christians, for the same Common Blessings for our selves and all other Christians. Thus also the Supper of the Lord is not a Private Supper, but the common Feast of Christians, and an Act of Catholick Communion.

Now we do assure our Casuist, That we do as Fellow Members, Pray to the same Common Father, in the Name of the same Common Saviour, for the same Common Blessings for our selves and all other Christians, and Celebrate the Lords Supper, not as a Private one, but as the Common Feast of Christians: only we don't do it by the same Form of Words call'd Common-Prayer, (as our Brethren of the Church of England do) no more than the French or Dutch do. And these being Acts of Catholick Communion, we are in Communion with the whole Catholick Church: And therefore we are not Schismatics, nor do we divide from the Christian Church, tho' we are Reproached as if we did.

(c) *Case p.* Thirdly, Another very favourable Passage of his is, That a Man (c) must live
19. Abrid. in Communion with the whole Christian
p. 19. Church; and this cannot be done without Actual Communion with some part of it. So
 that

I have nothing else to do, but to consider whether that part of the Catholick Church, wherein I live, be so sound that I may lawfully live in Communion with it ; and if it be, I am bound to do so under peril of Schism from the Catholick Church. Now how shall I know (b) which is a Sound (b) Case p. 43. Abrid. p. 27.

Why that is so (saith he), Which has nothing Sinful in its Communion : Otherwise, no Church can be Sound and Orthodox. Now that Man that separates from a Sound part of the Church, separates from the whole Church, because the Communion of the Church is but One. Now our Churches are a Sound and Orthodox Part of the Church, if the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England are Sound and Orthodox, which we have subscribed to, and perhaps with somewhat more of Sincerity than some others have done. We are willing our Churches should be try'd by the Definition of a Church, which we have in the 19th Article of the Church of England, and which is a much better one than what our Author has given us. 'Tis this, The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of Faithful Men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministred according to Christ's Ordinance in all those things that of necessity

sity are requisite to the same. Now I hope the Generality of our Members may pass for *Faithful Men*, as well as the Generality of the Members of Diocesan Churches. We appeal to all the World, whether *the pure Word of God is not preach'd*, and the *Sacraments duly ministred*, according to *Christ's Ordinance*: Tho' we don't Baptize according to the *Churches Ordinance*, excluding the Parents and superadding the Sign of the Cross; nor impose the Posture of *Kneeling* in the Lord's Supper: And we believe our Brethren dare not say these things are of *necessity requisite* to the same, so that it should be *No Baptism* for want of God-Fathers or the Cross; and *no Lord's Supper*, because we don't oblige Men to Kneel when they receive it.

So then our Author has furnisht us with an Argument to prove himself and the Generality of his Brethren to be Notorious Schismatics from the Catholick Church, because they refuse even so much as Occasional Communion with our Sound and Orthodox Churches, which are in the Places where they live.

CHAP. V.

The Doctor's Three Rules to distinguish between Schismatical and other Churches have two small Faults, viz. they are False and Useless. The first prov'd so, viz. That there must be but One Church in One Place; for one Church in the Bowels of another is horrid Schism. The French and Dutch Churches in England considered. The second and third Rule no better than the first.

BUT these are but sudden Pangs of Affection, which are quickly over. Mount *Ætna* will Blaze again, and send forth liquid streams of flaming Sulphur to terrify the Neighbour-hood. Our Author's great Design is to prove us *Schismatics*, and that of the worst sort, (a) *Schismatics from the Catholick Church*: (a) *Abridg.* And being *Dividers*, we can't partake in *P. 20.* the Covenant of Grace; but (b) *forfeit* (b) *Case* our Interest in it, and we have no Right *P. 8.* to the Blessings of it. *lb. p. 18.*

After

After his laying down a blind Preliminary, *That those Churches which are not Members of each other are separate Churches, &c.* which we have already taken

(a) *Case p.* Notice of; he promises to *make this* (a)
 20. *Abrid.* Plain; and in order thereunto, saith he,
 p. 20. *I shall lay down some few Rules, whereby we may Certainly know what Churches are in Communion with each other, and which are Schismatical Conventicles.*

1. His first Rule is a notable one, *viz.*
 (b) *Case* There (b) must be but One Church in
 p. 20. *A-* One Place.—Every Particular Church
 bridg. p. must have its Limits, as every Mem-
 20. ber in the Body has its proper Place :
 ' But when there is one Church within
 ' the Bowels of another, it is a notori-
 ' ous Schism. This is the Case of our
 ' Dissenters, &c.

Now this is as strange and schismatical a Rule as ever dropt from the Pen of a Learned Man : For the Proof of which, I desire the following Particulars may be consider'd.

§. I. 1. That 'tis very possible for a Church to impose Sinful Terms of Communion . And then 'tis confess'd, on all Hands, that Men who truly judge 'em so to be, must separate from such a Church ; and I hope it will not be deny'd but that they are obliged, if they
 are

are a competent Number, to form themselves into a Church; and not live like a parcel of Heathens, without Publick Christian Worship and Ordinances. Whereupon, here is one Church in the Bowels of another, and a notorious Schism, the Guilt of which will fall on the Church that imposes Sinful Terms of Communion. But will any Man say, That thereupon that Church of Necessity must be *cut off from the Catholick Church*, and that it *can't partake in the Gospel-Covenant*, but has *forfeited all Interest* in it, and has *no Right to the Blessings of it*? What does our Casuist think of all the Popish Churches? If ever there were any Schismaticks in the World, the Papists are the Men. Now his Brethren do generally acknowledge the Roman Church to be a *true* tho' a very *unsound* Part of the Catholick Church, and that there is a Possibility of being Saved in the Communion of it, tho' attended with very great Danger; which I believe our Author himself also will acknowledge. But yet this Rule of his at one Stroke chops 'em all off from the Catholick Church and the Covenant of Grace.

2. Nor is he less Severe against the Episcopal Men in Scotland. There the Presbyterian Church is the Church *Estab-*

blish'd by Law; and yet those of the E-
 piscopal Perswasion have their Meeting-
 Houses in the very self-same Places and
 Parishes in *Edenburgh* and other Cities
 and Towns in that Kingdom; who
 withdraw from Ordinary Communion with
 (a) the Presbyterian Church, in which they
 live, into Separate Societies, which is to
 renounce its Communion: And let our Au-
 thor assign on the part of the Laity a ne-
 cessary Cause for it, if he can: If he can't,
 he must grant it to be a Schismatical Sepa-
 ration. There is one Church within the
 Bowels of another, viz. an Episcopal with-
 in the Bowels of a Presbyterian Church,
 which is a notorious Schism. This is the
 case of the Scotch Episcopal Dissenters,
 who refuse to Worship God in the same As-
 semblies with the Presbyterians. In the
 same Kingdom they hold separate Assemblies,
 (b) under distinct kinds of Government and
 different Governours, and condemn the Con-
 stitution if not the Modes of the Worship
 of the National Presbyterian Church E-
 stablish'd by Law, and endeavour to draw
 away Members from her. How the Pres-
 byterian Ministers do manage their Con-
 troversy with these Episcopal Dissenters
 there, I am not at leisure now to exa-
 min. But did those Learned Men need
 any Assistance, our Casuist would most
 effectually

(a) Abridg.
 p. 20.

(b) Abrid.
 p. 21.

effectually help 'em. He would wave the Case of the *Ministers*, and deal only with the *Laity*; and tell 'em (c), ' *They* ^{(c) Abridg.}
 ' have nothing else to do but to consider ^{p. 28.}
 ' whether that part of the Catholick
 ' Church wherein *they* live be so sound,
 ' that *they* may lawfully live in *Communion*
 ' with it; and if it be, *they* are ^{p. 19.}
 ' bound to do so under peril of Schism
 ' from the Catholick Church. And I
 suppose the *Scotch* Presbyterian Church
 may pass for a Sound and Orthodox
 One; their Confession of Faith has been
 so esteem'd hitherto, and I don't know
 that they have thrown aside their Old
 One, and set up a New Heretical One in
 its stead.

In short, one of these two things will
 unavoidably follow from our Casuist's
 Principles; either that the Presbyterians
 in *Scotland*, tho' they be the Church E-
 stablish'd by Law, are cut off from the
 Catholick Church; or the Episcopal
 Dissenters are so: Let him chuse which
 of these two he pleases. I perceive some
 Men are very near of kin to *Nebuchad-
 nezar's* Servants; the *English* Dissenters
 must be cast into the fiery Furnace, tho' it
 be with the apparent hazard that the same
 Flames shall kindle upon and flay, if not
 themselves, yet at least their Brethren of

the Episcopal Perswasion in other Countries.

3. This Principle of our Casuist will make as mad work among the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* in *Germany*; and (which it may be our Casuist will more regret) among the *Arminians* in the Low-Countries; and in the Empire of the Grand Seignor, where Liberty of Conscience is granted to Christians of all Denominations. They have their respective different Churches, which the Princes of the Empire, and the great Turk does tolerate, (and that's more than our topping Church-men would do if they had Power in their Hands) and these Churches are *in the same Place*, and one within the *Bowels of another*. Were our Casuist there, he would lop off all of 'em from the Catholick Church, one only excepted; but which of 'em should be that One he would graciously spare, I shall expect he will tell us. I suppose if any of 'em have no Diocesan Bishops at the Head of 'em, this unmerciful Man would give them no Quarter. But if several of 'em should be in the Episcopal Mode, or none of 'em should be so, he would be puzzled to which of 'em he should extend his Extraordinary Grace and Favour.

4. This

4. This Fundamental Principle of Church-Communion was altogether unknown to the incomparable *Grotius*, and the Learned Dr. *Hammond*; who tell us (d), 'That there were two different Churches at *Jerusalem*, at *Rome*, at *Antioch*, at *Ephesus*, and other Places, one of the *Jews*, another of the *Gentiles*, Planted and Govern'd by the Apostles themselves. Hereby they pretend to solve the Difficulties in Ecclesiastical History about the Successors in those Churches. If this Notion of theirs be true, the Principle of our Casuist must be false, or the Apostles must be Schismatics, or at least very Ignorant of the First Principle of Church-Communion. Or if this Notion of theirs be False, then *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* were the Schismatical and Ignorant Men, to advance such a Notion as this, and fancy the Apostles St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* would give so fatal an Example of notorious Schism, by erecting one Church in the Bowels of another.

5. This Principle will be like a Fire-Ship fill'd with Combustible Matter and Murdering-Shot in *New-England*, and among the English Churches in *Holland*. In *Boston* in *New-England* they have several Churches, the Members whereof

live intermingled one among another ; for they are not Circumscribed within Parish-Bounds, so that all who live in such a Precinct, must of necessity be Members of one and the same Church. Consequently they are most notorious Schismatics, and cut off from the Catholick Church, and are as very a Wilderness as the poor *Indians* among whom they have settled. They had better have staid in *Europe*, than thus fatally outfall the Catholick Church, as well as the first Meridian, and make themselves a Colony of Heathens.

Our Brethren there had a Charter from one of our Kings ; and I suppose their Churches may pass for Churches *Establisht by Law*, and for Sound and Orthodox ones too ; at least they were so till the Governour set up an Episcopal one with Common-Prayer, &c. Now there being more Churches than one in a Place, and the Members of them living within *one another's Bowels*, there's a notorious Schism ; and either the Governour and his Church, or else the Congregational Churches that were formerly planted among them, are cut off from the Catholick Church. But I suppose our Author will grant the latter Consequence, as black a one as it is ; or which
is

is worse, say, they never were Parts and Members of it: And that for this profound Reason, Because they are Clubs of Men, who impudently pretend to be (Independent) Churches, formed upon such a Church-Covenant between (Pretended) Pastors and People as is no part of the Baptismal Vow, which is one and the same ^{Abridgm.} for all Mankind, and the only Covenant ^{pag. 17.} Christ has made; formed upon Humane Contracts and Covenants, on which no Church-State can depend.

Let's therefore leave these Pagan English Men, and sail away for Holland. There's an old English Church at Rotterdam, and another at Amsterdam; Dr. Cockbern and Mr. Milbourn went to those two Places to set up Episcopal Churches there: (tho' the latter has left his new Plantation, wherein he is succeeded by Mr. Masson, one of my Lord of London's French Missionaries) So that there are Churches of English Men one within the Bowels of another. Now I demand which of these are the Schismatics; and whether Dr. Cockbern and Mr. Luke Milbourn, (or Mr. Masson) with their Followers; or whether Mr. Hill and Mr. Fitts, the two Presbyterian Pastors, with their Disciples, are cut off from the Catholick Church? Methinks those two Episcopal

Divines had better have kept at Home, than have cross'd the Seas with their Orders and Common-Prayers on so pernicious a Design as to run themselves and their Friends, or push so many of their Country-men out of the Christian Church.

(f) Letter
to Anony-
mus, p. 13.
Abridgm.
p. 20.

But whatever he may do at *Rotterdam*, our Author can't fetch them off at *Amsterdam*, by saying (f), as he does, *That a Nation may permit those Foreigners that are among 'em to model their Congregations according to the Rules of those Churches to which they Originally belong, and that without any Danger of Schism.* For the *Dutch* have not left the *English* Church at *Amsterdam* to their own Liberty; but the *English* Church there have resign'd their Liberty, and are become a Branch ingrafted into the *Dutch* Church. Wherefore, according to our Author, Dr. Cockburn and his Accomplices are notorious Schismatics from the Catholick Church.

§. II. Our Casuist could not but foresee the Objection drawn from the Congregations of Foreigners (the *Dutch* and *French* Churches) who do not joyn with the Church of *England*. This is one Church within the Bowels of another. Now to ward off the Charge of Schism from them,

them, he says what I have just now quoted; and further adds (g); *A bare variety of Ceremonies makes no Schism between Churches, while they live in Communion with each other.* Now every Particular National Church has Authority over her own Members, to prescribe the Rules of Worship; but as she does not impose upon other Churches at a distance; so she may allow the same Liberty to the Members of such Foreign Churches, when they live within her Jurisdiction. For tho' all true Churches are Members of each other, yet each Church has a peculiar Jurisdiction; and therefore for the Church of England to allow Foreigners to observe their own Rules, is not to allow Separate Communion; but to leave them to the Government of that Church to which they belong. So that distinct Congregations of Foreigners who own the Communion of our Church, tho' they observe the Customs of their own, are not Schismatical as the Separate Conventicles of our Dissenters are. On which I make these following Remarks.

I. Our Casuist wavers between the Church and State, and knows not well which of these has permitted those Foreigners to live in a distinct Church-Communion. In the beginning, tis the Nation may permit those Foreigners to model

(g) Letter
to Anony-
mus, p. 13.
Abridgm.
p. 20, 21.

del their Congregations according to the Rules of those Churches to which they originally belong. But before we are got to the End of the Paragraph, tis *the Church of England* that does allow *Foreigners* to observe their own Rules, &c. To Her they owe their Thanks, that her rigorous Canons are not imposed upon 'em: Tho, after all, I think she is Indebted for it to neither one nor t'other, but to the Indulgence of the Kings of England. A. B. *Land* endeavour'd to bring the *French Churches* here under the Yoke. Dr. *Heylin* gives us an Account of their Wrestling against it. Upon this Occasion

(h) *The N. C. Vindic. from the Abuses of Mr. Durell, pag. 112, 113.* Cardinal *Richlien* (h) gave out such a Speech as this, *If the King of England, being a Protestant, will not suffer two Disciplines; why should the King of France, being a Papist, suffer two Religions?* In the late Reign a *Quo Warranto* was bro't against them: The Officers of the Parishes without the City, for fear their numerous Poor should fall on 'em, procured the Stop to the intended Proceedings; but I never heard that any others espous'd their Cause. I would not choose our *Casnist's* Notion; but rather direct my Reader to the late Address of our Convocation to his Majesty; for by their Concern therein they expressed for our Brethren Abroad, with greater Advantage to her, a Judgment

ment may be formed of the Charity of our Church to the Members of another.

2. Our Casuist is plainly mistaken in imagining, that the Foreign Churches in *England* are under the Government of any Church in another Country. The several Churches of 'em at *London*, *Canterbury*, and other Places, used to have Synods of their own, tho' they have for some time been intermitted : But they are not subject to any National Church out of our Land. The *French* Church were originally *Walloons*, and at their first Establishment here, there was no National Church that I know of for them to be accountable unto. And tho' the *Dutch* Church, as they are constituted at the present, may observe many of the same Rules with the Establish'd Church of *Holland*, and may accept of Fraternal Advices thence ; yet neither the Pastors nor Members of that particular Church are any ways obliged by the Canons which are made in the Synods of *Holland*. And the Church in *Holland* would be ridiculous if she should pretend to any Jurisdiction over the *Dutch* Church here, whose Members are the Subjects, not of their *State*, but of the *King of England*. Suppose there should again be a War between

His

His Majesty and the States (which God forbid) and the National Church there should order her Members to observe a Solemn Fast to Pray for a Blessing on their Arms against our King, I would fain know whether it would be Lawful for the *Dutch* Church here to obey such Orders, or not? Time has been when Dr. *Sherlock* was very sensible how great an Absurdity this was. ‘ It is, (said he) both an intollerable Grievance, which has been complained of by Roman Catholick Princes and People, that Appeals should lie to *Rome*, and the Bishops and People of all Nations in the World be forced to have their Causes heard there; and it is a Derogation from the Authority of Sovereign Princes to have a Foreign Bishop exercise a Superiour Jurisdiction in their own Kingdoms. Now if the *French* or *Dutch* Churches in *London* are under the Government and Jurisdiction of the National Church of *France* and *Holland*, then an Appeal in case a Member be aggriev’d, will lie to *them*. Tis possible thereupon, that a Man may submit to the Inconvenience of crossing over to *France* or tripping to *Holland*, which is no long Voyage; yet, suppose a Church of *Greeks*, or *Muscovites*, or *Georgians*, or some other

(i) *Vind. of*
some Prot.
Principles,
p. 75.

other Nation further removed from *England*, should settle in *London*; they being left under the Government of their own National Church, Appeals would lie from the Church here to their National Church there: But I believe it would be accounted an intollerable Grievance, first to sail, and after that to foot it, a great many Hundred Leagues to have their Causes heard there. And sure it would be no less a *Derogation from the Authority of Sovereign Princes to have a Knot of Dutch or French Presbyters exercise a Superiour Jurisdiction in their Kingdoms*, than for a *Foreign Bishop* to do the same. Yea, I think it would be the greater *Derogation* of the two. For Presbyters are but Subjects; whereas a Bishop is a *Supreme Governour* in his Diocess as well as His Majesty in His Kingdom.

3. According to our Author's Notions, the Church of *England* can't allow these Foreigners, when they live within her Jurisdiction, to observe the Rules of that National Church to which they originally did belong; and if the Church of *England* pretend to deal so Graciously with 'em, 'tis a Liberty they are bound not to use: For the whole Catholick Church, as he tells us, is but *One Communion*

Case p. 8. Abridgm. p. 18. *munion.* And two Churches that are not

Members of each other, cannot partake in the same Covenant, but the Divider forfeits his Interest in it : i. e. When the particular Members of those two different Churches, occasionally come into each others Territories, the one is bound to Admit 'em, and the other no less bound to Join with 'em in the Offices of Religion, such as Praying, Hearing, Receiving the Sacrament, &c. This I guess (and I can but guess) is the meaning of this dark Oracle, (who promis'd to speak with *All possible Clearness*) by what he says after-

Case p. 10. Abrid. p. 18. a-
bout the middle..

wards, viz. To be in Communion with the Church is to be a Member of it : And this is call'd Communion, because all Church-Members have a Common Right to Church Privileges, and a Common Obligation to the Duties of Church-Members. 'Tis true, this word Communion is commonly used to signify Praying, Hearing and Receiving the Sacrament together ; but strictly speaking, those Offices are not Communion, but an Exercise of Communion. Now tho' the Church of England should dispense with Foreigners so far as to leave them to their Liberty of using or not using their own Right ; yet I hope she does not pretend to dispense with their Obligation to the
Duties

Duties of Church-Members. They are therefore bound on pain of being cut off from the Catholick Church, not to set up distinct Churches of their own in *England*; and a *French* or a *Dutch* Man who comes over hither as a Traveller, is bound to joyn, not with the *French* or *Dutch* Church here, but with the Church of *England*: Especially they who have resided so long here as to understand our Language are bound to do it; and they who do not understand it, are bound on the Peril of Eternal Damnation to learn it as fast as ever they can, that they may joyn with the Church of *England* also.

So much may suffice for our Author's First Rule: By which I perceive there is a very peculiar Reason why a Church should be call'd a *Body*, because there can be but *One Church* in *One Place*. I shall only add, That the Dissenters have *just* Cause to complain, that the Church of *England* is pleased to be more Civil and Complaisant to Strangers than Natives, who, one would think, might expect a kinder Treatment in their own Country. It were much to be wisht that she would be so good natured as to leave our Members to the Government of those Churches to which they belong, and suffer us
to

to *model our own Congregations according to our own Rules*, which we believe to be agreeable to the Scripture Pattern. And I am much mistaken if something like this has not been done: For the State has given us an Act of *Indulgence*, in which there was the joynt Concurrence of His Majesty, the Supream Head and Governour of the National Church; and both Houses of Parliament, in one of which, 'tis well known, the Lords Spiritual do sit, who are the Ecclesiastical Rulers of the Church of *England*; and then I think we need not ask the Leave of any Inferiour Clergy-man, or any Petty Student in a Colledge, who tho' he may have leisure enough to make an Abridgment of other Mens Writings, yet has no Authority to *abridge* us of that Liberty which his Superiors as well as ours have vouchsafed to us.

§. III. I proceed to his 2d. Rule, which *Casep. 22.* is this: *Those are Separate Churches which*
Abridg. p. 21. *divide from the Communion of any Church from any dislike of its Doctrine, Government or Worship.*

Now if by *Separate Churches* our Author means *Schismatical* ones (as he must if the Scope and Design of his Discourse be consider'd) most of those things which

I have just now observ'd when I consider'd his First Rule, will as effectually overthrow this which is his Second: Which I shall not repeat.

A terrible Squabble there has been between the *Greek* and *Latin* Church about the *Filioq;* being added to the Creed. And so there is between the *Syrians* or *Melchites* on the one hand, and the *Maronites* and *Jacobites* on the other.

The *Copti* in *Egypt* repute the *Roman* Church to be Heretical, and avoid the Communion and Conversation of the *Latins* no less than of the *Jews*. The

Brere-
woods En-
quir. p 128
133, 159,
171.

Armenians have done as much by the *Greeks*, whom they have in more Detestation than any other Sect. The *Lutherans* are very hot against the *Calvinists*, treat 'em little better than as Hereticks; tho' some of the *Calvinists* have been very yielding and ready to open their Church Doors to Them. Many more Instances (if needful) might be given of particular Persons and whole Churches mutually dividing from each others Communion from Dislike in Doctrine, Government or Worship. Wherefore, according to our Casuist's Rule, they are very wretched Schismatics, cut off from the Body of Christ, which, according to his Notion, would prove a very small one indeed.

I believe our Author himself will not deny, but that a *Just Dislike* of the Doctrine, Government, or Worship of any Church, where Men are required to own such Doctrines as are False, submit to such Government, or join in such Worship as is unlawful, will vindicate their withdrawing Communion from the Charge of Schism. So that this Rule is not warily nor so plainly express'd as it should.

§. IV. These are our Author's first and second Rules, which as they are not true, so neither (if they were true) would they answer his End in laying them down ; which he tells us was, that thereby (a) *we may certainly know what Churches are in Communion with each other, and which are Schismatical Conventicles.* For supposing his first Rule to be True, viz. that *there must be but one Church in one place* ; seeing that, in the same place, we find *de Facto* there are several, for instance, an *Episcopal*, a *Presbyterian*, an *Independent*, and an *Anabaptist* Church ; this Rule, indeed, cuts 'em all out but one ; but what Light does it give whereby an honest Lay Man may certainly know, which is that one ; especially when all of them are according to Law ;
and

(a) *Case p.*
20. *Abrid.*
p. 20.

and there are Men of Piety and Learning who belong to all these Communions, and some of all these Perswasions talk very highly for their own way. 'Tis as if I should say to an honest Traveller who is at a loss, I'll give you a Direction whereby you may *certainly know* the Road to *London*; and that is, there is but *one Path* that leads thither; whereas there may be several; one may be a little round-about; another may be a cleaner, and another a safer one; but all of 'em may bring a Man thither at last. But suppose there is really but one; when the poor Traveller comes to the place where the Road splits into four several ways, there he may stand gaping for a wiser Director, to tell him which of these is the one only Path; especially when he finds great multitudes of Persons all pretending to be bound to the same place, and travelling some in one Path, and some in another; the Men being divided in their Minds as much as the Way in which they are; every one with Confidence enough telling him, all the rest besides himself and those who accompany him, are very much in the wrong, and will infallibly tumble into some deep Holes, or fall down some Fatal Rock to the apparent Danger of their Necks and

F 2

Lives,

Lives ; which if they escape, it must be by Miracle. It would be some Comfort to the Man, if he were well assured that which soever of 'em he did strike into, it would bring him at last to his desired place ; tho' one of 'em, if he could but hit upon it, would more directly bring him thither. 'Tis easy to apply this to the Business in hand. This I dare to say, that if a Man be a true Believer on our Lord Jesus Christ, a Fearer of God, and a Worker of Righteousness, whether he be a Church of *England* Man, a Presbyterian, an Independent, or an Anabaptist, he shall be saved. Let him get the best Directions he can, and walk Charitably according to the best Light he has ; and not be disturb'd at the hideous Noise of our Ecclesiastical Bigots ; but let him know for his Comfort, that however these bold Men may sit in Judgment upon him now ; they shall *not* do so at the Last Day. The World shall then be judged in Righteousness by *one only Man* our Lord Jesus Christ, who is also God *over all, blessed for ever more, Amen.*

Our Author's 2d Rule, *viz. Those are separate Churches which divide from the Communion of any Church, from any Dislike of its Doctrine, Government, or Worship ; or as he afterwards adds, which re-*
nounce

nounce each others Communion, or at least withdraw ordinary Communion from each other from a profess'd Dislike, is like the First, and will leave an Honest Christian as much bewildred as that did. For the Generality of the Members of Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent and Anabaptist Churches do dislike the Constitution and Government, the Way of Worship, and some of the Doctrines taught in each others Churches: And upon that Dislike do withdraw ordinary Communion with each other. And tho' some sober Men can have Occasional Communion either with one or t'other; yet that, as our Casuist informs us, is *no Communion* at all, nor does it deserve the *name of Communion*. Wherefore by the glimmering Moonlight of this second Rule, how shall I *certainly know* which are the Schismatical Conventicles? And which is the one only Catholick Church?

§. V. It may be our Author's 3d Rule may give a more certain sound; and that is this (a); *Those are separate Churches* (a) *Cas. p. 23. Abrid. p. 21.* *which do not own each other's Members as their own.* This will fall very heavy upon our Casuist's own Church: For the Dissenters never have, by any Publick Act, pass'd a Condemning Sentence

against the Members of the Church of England ; as his *Church Representative* met in Convocation has done upon all the Dissenters. We are Excommunicated *ipso Facto* by their Synod, and told we shall not be restored, 'till we have publicly revoked our wicked Errors in finding fault, tho' never so modestly, with any Passage in their Common Prayer, their Book of ordering Bishops, Priests and Deacons, or the Government of the Church by *Bishops* (who with *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, they Themselves say are the Only Ones, that have a Divine Original.) And by *Arch-Bishops*, *Deans* and *Arch-Deacons*. Now tho' these are Officers of a meer Humane Institution, and the two later owe their Original, as Bp. Burnet tells us, to *Papal* Authority, and a By-Clause in an Act of Parliament: Yet, as if these were not sufficient, there is added, *and the Rest that bear Office in the same* ; which we are sure takes in *Lay-Chancellors*, who are notorious Ufurpers of that Authority which, as our Episcopal Divines tell us, does by Divine Right belong to the Bishop.

By their severe Canons, 'tis plain, the Church of England does not own any of the Members of our Churches as their own Members ; and consequently by our Casuist's

suist's own Rule is a Schismatical Conventicle, which we ought not to hold any Communion with.

CHAP. VI.

Of Occasional and Fixed Communion. The Doctor's Mistake about the Nature of 'em.

HAVING done with our Author's Rules, we proceed to his Discourse about Occasional and Fix'd Communion. By *Fix'd Communion*, says he (a), *the Dissenters understand an actual and constant Communicating with some one particular Church, as fix'd Members of it.* By *Occasional Communion*, they mean *Praying, Hearing, and Receiving the Sacrament at some other Church (of which they do not own themselves to be Members) as Occasion serves; that is, either to gratify their own Curiosity, or to serve some Secular End, or to avoid the Imputation of Schism.* I would advise our Author not to flirt at the Dissenters about their *Secular Ends* in *Occasional Communion* with his Church, lest he provoke them to look back to his and some other Clergymens taking the Oaths

(a) *Cass p. 26. Abrid. p. 22.*

to the present Government, in Defiance to their former avow'd Principles. After his sticking out so long, whereby he drew others into that Snare from which he so cautiously pull'd out his own Foot : The World will be apt to believe, that Dr. *Overall's* Convocation Book would not so suddainly have turned the Scales, if something else had not been cast into the Ballance.

The True Reasons why some Dissenters have Occasionally Communicated with the Church of *England* are these that follow ; a Favourable Sentiment of the Church-Modes of Worship as tolerable, tho' not desirable ; especially when they could not be allow'd to Worship their Maker in another way more agreeable to them ; a Charitable Design of contributing somewhat to the Healing of our Differences about the Circumstantials of Religion, that by such Steps the way might be paved towards a Happy Union of the divided Parties ; a Catholick Temper of Spirit, which made them unwilling to renounce all Communion with the Church of *England*, and caused some of them, when there was no Storm in view, ever now and then to joyn with her ; a generous Desire of doing Service to their Country and the Government ; and an honest

honest Intention to save themselves and their Families from Ruin, by going as far as lawfully they could to prevent their being torn in pieces by persecuting Bigots, when like hungry Lions they were let loose upon 'em.

Now our Casuist tells us (a), that *fixt* (a) Case p. 26. Abrid. p. 22. *Communion is the only true Notion of Communion* : For *Occasional Communion* does not deserve the name of *Communion*. But may we not joyn (b) in acts of *Worship* (b) Case p. 30. Abrid. p. 23. about the middle. with other Churches of which we are no Members ? This he owns. But then, says he, these are not properly acts of *Communion*. And yet a little before, he tells us, *Where ever I Communicate, whether in that Church in which I usually live, (which he allows to be fixt Communion) or in any other particular Church where I am accidentally present (which he grants to be Occasional Communion) my Communion is of the same Nature.* Whence it unavoidably follows, that *fixt Communion* being of the same Nature with *occasional Communion* ; and *Occasional Communion* not deserving the name of *Communion*, there is no such thing as *Communion* at all, nothing that does deserve that name, and there are no such things as proper Acts of *Communion* ; And so we have lost the very Title of this Chapter about
the

the necessity of living in constant Communion with the Church of England.

The Battery on which he plants his Cannon for the beating in pieces of all Occasional Communion (and whereby he has unawares destroy'd *fixt* Communion (a) *Case p. too*) is (a), that a Man must be a Church-Member before he has a Right to Communion *10, 11. A-brid. p. 18. and p. 22.* on with the Church. That joyning in the Publick Offices of Religion, such as Praying, Hearing, and Receiving the Sacrament, are Acts of Communion, if perform'd by Church Members ; but others are but Intruders if they perform 'em.

Now this is true, if it be understood of a Man's being a Member, or no Member, of the *Catholick Church*. If a Man be not a Member of the *Catholick Church* *i. e.* if he be no Christian, but a Mahometan or an Heathen, if he pretend to joyn in Christian Prayer and Sacraments with the Church, 'tis not an Act of Church Communion, and such a one is an Intruder.

But this is not true, if it be understood of one who is a Member of the *Catholick Church* ; *i. e.* who is a Christian ; and who besides is a Member of a particular Church ; and whose Affairs call him into a distant place. As suppose an *English Protestant*, who is a Member of the

the Church of England, should travel to Holland, or Geneva, of either of which Churches he is not a Member; if he joyn with them in their Publick Prayers, and having the Consent of the Pastor of the Church, joyn with them in the Lord's Supper, he is no Intruder: And this is but *Occasional* Communion, and it is properly an Act of Communion. For, if he be free from Scandal, he has a Right to joyn with them in these Offices, and may claim it as his due: And he has an Obligation ordinarily so to do; unless a Man may lawfully live like an Heathen for a Year together, or longer, because he is not in his own Country, or with that Particular Church of which he is a Fixed, Stated Member.

So that our Author's Pen runs a little too fast, when he says (a), *I have prov'd,* ^{(a) Case p. 26. Abrid.} *that he who is not a Member cannot perform* p. 22. *an Act of Communion; and therefore, 'tis as plain a Contradiction to talk of an Occasional Act of Communion, as of an Occasional Membership.* To which he adds, *Since every Act of Communion is an Act of Communion with every Sound Part of the Catholick Church, therefore the Exercise of Christian Communion is equally Fixt and Constant, or equally Occasional with the whole*

whole Catholick Church. And a little af-

(a) *Casē p.*
28. *Abrid.*
p. 23.

ter (a), *Where ever I Communicate, whether in that Church in which I usually live, or in any other Particular Church where I am accidentally present, my Communion is of the same Nature.* This, I think, is a great Mistake : For my Communion with the other Parts of the Catholick Church, is but *mental* ; my Communion with that Particular Church with which I actually joyn, is *visible* and *local* : My Communion with that Particular Church whereof I am a Fixed Member, is *stated* and *ordinary*, and my Duty, because I am a Member of that Particular Church ; but my Communion with another Particular Church where I am accidentally present, is *extraordinary* and *accidental*, and my Duty, because I am a Member of the Catholick Church, and providentially brought among them ; now these, I think, are not *of the same Nature*. So that when

(b) *Casē p.*
39. *Abrid.*
p. 26.

our Casuist saith (b), *I have already shewn, how absurd this Distinction of Fixt and Occasional Communion is ; he has only shew'd himself Absurd ; which he further does when he adds, That every Act of Communion, if he mean it (as he must if he talk to the purpose) of Communion with any Particular Church, is an Act of Fixt Communion with that Church.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Whether Constant Communion be a Duty, where ever Occasional Communion is Lawful.

A Man may travel a great many Miles before he gets sight of the Place whither he is bound. So has our Author done; and 'tis his Fault if I have done the like, who was obliged to follow him. But now we draw near: *For, P. 23* saith he, *having thus explain'd the Three foregoing Particulars, I proceed to the main Business, which was to shew, that it is the indispensable Duty of all English Men to live in Constant Communion with the Establish'd Church of England.* Three Steps he will take in order to this:

1. He will shew, *That Communion with some Church or other is a necessary Duty.* *Case p. 40. Abridgm. P. 26.* Here I am of the same Mind with him. I shall not take Notice, therefore, of any thing he says here; because, tho there are a Flirt or two at us, we shall meet with them again under the following Heads: For,

2. He will shew, *That Constant Communion is a Necessary Duty, where Occasional*

onal Communion is Lawful. This General Assertion of his he endeavours to prove, because Constant Communion with some Particular Church, is every Man's Duty ; which must be with that Particular Church where he lives ; which can be but One in one Place : And therefore, if I can Occasionally Communicate with that One, I must Constantly Communicate with it. Now the Foundation of this Argument is *weak*, as I have shew'd, *viz.* That there can be but One Church in One Place.

And 'tis not hard to prove, That *Constant Communion* is not a *Necessary Duty*, where *Occasional Communion is Lawful*. For, suppose a Man live in *Germany* or *Turkey*, where there are several Churches, as of *Calvinists*, *Lutherans*, and *Minists* or *Anabaptists*, *Greeks*, &c. if they require no Sinful Terms of Communion, Occasional Communion with any or all of them is Lawful. Does it thence follow, that Constant Communion with them is Necessary ? Then are we bound to be Fixed Members of, and have Constant, Fixed, Presential Communion with, several Churches at *one* and the *same* time : And so are bound to what is naturally impossible, to be in *different* Places, and to joya with the Christians of so many *different*

different Communions at one and the same moment.

Another *Consideration* which he offers for the Proof of this Assertion, is (a), ' That ^{(a) *Abridg*} 'tis not Lawful to Communicate with ^{P. 27.} ' two Distinct and Separate Churches ' in the same Place, as for instance, sometimes with the Church of England, ' sometimes with the *Presbyterians*; because this is directly contrary to all the ' Principles of Church-Communion: ' For to be in Communion with the ' Church, is to be a Member of it: And ' to be a Member of two Separate and ' Opposite Churches, is to be as *contrary* ' to our selves as those Separate Churches are to each other: And whosoever ' Communicates with both those Churches, on one side or other, Communicates ' in a Schism. And a little before, under his first Head, to the same purpose, (b) ' When Men Communicate Occasi- ^{(b) *Case* p. 40. *Abrids*} ' onally as they speak with all the differ- ^{p. 26.} ' ent Parties of Christians in a Divided ' Church, they either Communicate with ' none or with all of 'em. A very admirable way of Arguing! *If they Communicate Occasionally with all, either 'tis with none, or else 'tis with all.* This very nearly resembles the famous Speech of a Noble Peer, in the Vestry at St. Martins.

But,

But to let that pass; for great Authors have their Slips and Nods. See how unmercifully he squeezes these Whiffers between the two sides of his Pinchers: *If with none, then they maintain Communion with no Church* This is Demonstration; and old *Euclid* was a pitiful Fumbler to our Casuist; *If they Communicate with none, then they maintain Communion with none.* Well, let that pass too, for 'tis Unanswerable. Now let us see what a Toss he gives those Wretches with the other Horn of his Dilemma, who can't keep their Places, but must run from one side to 'other: *But if they Communicate with All, then they are Members of Separate and Opposite Parties; that is, they are contrary to themselves, & on one side or other are certain to be Schismatics.* Now this Argument too stands upon a sandy Bottom, *viz.* That Occasional Communion is *no* Communion, and that where ever a Man Communicates, he does it as a *Fixed* Member: The Vanity of which I have shewn in the foregoing Chapter; and therefore I might dismiss it. But I shall further add; Suppose a Man in *Germany* lives in Stated Communion with a Church of *Calvinists* as a Fixed Member, and yet to testify his Catholick Spirit, and promote an amicable Correspondence

dence between *divided* Protestants, should now and then Occasionally joyn with the *Lutheran* Church ; I don't see how this would make him a *Member* of both those Churches, nor would he hereby be a *Schismatick*, but farther from it ; nor be as *contrary to himself* as those two Parties and Churches are. No more than St. *Paul* was a *Schismatick*, or *contrary to himself*, who joyned in Communion with *Jews* and *Gentiles* at *Antioch*, and withstood *Peter* to his Face, for withdrawing and separating from the later. *Gal. 2.*
 Nay, if a Protestant should be in the *Palatinate*, or in any other Country, where there are a *Calvinist* and a *Lutheran* Church, and but one Temple, wherein the one Assembles on the Lord's Day Morning, the other in the Afternoon : A Pious Man would hardly be satisfy'd with joyning in Publick Worship only *once* in that Holy Day. Suppose, therefore, he should Statedly every Lord's Day joyn in Communion with both (the Leave of the Pastors being obtain'd) in *all* Acts of Worship ; on the account of their Consent in the Essentials of Christianity, whereby *both* of 'em are Churches, and Parts of the Catholick Church : And he should do this without concerning himself about their little *Particularities*, the

Profession of which is not imposed on him, and which do not *constitute* 'em Churches, nor *marr* their being True ones: How will any prove him to be *contrary to himself*? Or to be a *Schismatick*? I should think him a very *Catholick* Christian, whom no Man can justly blame.

Had our Casuist been at *Geneva*, (unless he had happen'd to be there in that bright minute when *Dr. Burnet* was on the Spot) he must have lived like an Hea-then. For that's a *Presbyterian* Church; and had he Communicated with them, if he had not been a *Schismatick*, yet on his own Principles he must have been as *contrary to himself* as a *Presbyterian* and an *Episcopal* Church are to each other.

But after all, for any thing our Author has offer'd to the contrary, in the same place there may be separate, *i. e.* distinct Churches, which may differ from each other in sundry Points, that are Accidental; and *so far* they may be *Opposite* to each other, as being *founded* (in matters of less importance) *on contrary Principles, and acting by contrary Rules*; who yet need not in our Author's Phrase, *Pursue contrary Ends to the Ruin and Subversion of each other*: And would not do it,

Abridgm.
p. 21.

it, if both sides were acted by the Spirit of Christ. That is, there may be a Church that has a Legal Establishment, and richly endow'd; and yet there may be a Toleration for others who are in things besides the Foundation of a different Perswasion: This we are sure there may be, for God be thanked *de Facto* it is so. And they need not sharpen their Swords to cut each others Throats; but will whet each others Industry in carrying on the great Design of Saving the Souls of Men. For the Proof of this, I refer the Reader to Mr. *Glanvil*, who resolves the Necessity of the Parish Minister's Diligence and Study, and Preaching twice on a Lord's Day, into this, that otherwise the People will run to the Conventicles. And Experience in many places shews, that our Brethren in the Communion of the Church of *England*, may thank the Dissenters, in a great measure, for the good Food they have in their Churches, and the Plenty of it too. Where *Persons* are all of a Mind, Learning and Religion also dwindle away, and Men sink into Idleness and Sloth. The Ingenious, but Peevish Mr. *Hunt*, who treats Us with the greatest Scorn at every turn, yet drops this observable Passage: • Upon Consideration, I think

Dialogue about Preaching, p. 6. it. p. 49.

Postscript p. 86.

G 2

‘ this

‘ this their (*meaning the Nonconformists*)
 ‘ Scrupulosity may be of God, and that
 ‘ some Men are by him framed to it :
 ‘ That he hath provided it as a Bar or
 ‘ Obstacle in the Natures and Complexi-
 ‘ ons of some devout Men against any
 ‘ Innovations whatsoever, that danger-
 ‘ ous ones may not settle upon the
 ‘ Church ; for the better maintaining the
 ‘ Simplicity and Purity of the Christian
 ‘ Religion and Worship. Yea, Chri-
 stians may Learn from the wise Heathen
 Philosopher *Themistius*, who in his Speech
 to the Emperor *Valens*, to perswade him
 to cease from Persecution, says, ‘ That
 ‘ he ought not to admire at the Disagree-
 ‘ ment of Opinions among Christians,
 ‘ &c. and begg’d him to consider that
 the most excellent and useful Arts had
 never been brought to such Perfection,
 but by the *Difference of Judgment and*
Strife among the Artists themselves ; nay,
 that Philosophy, the Mother of all good
 Arts, had risen from small Beginnings to
 such a height of Perfection, by *Differen-*
ces among Learned Men. And Socrates
 tells us, *That by this Speech of his the Em-*
peror was somewhat cool’d, and the Heat
of Persecution abated.

Ecc. Hist.
L. 4. Ch.
 32.

And

And the Safety of the *State* is hereby promoted too: For after all, Men will be of different Minds; and who ever is oppressed, whether he ought or not, will endeavour to get from under the Wheel that crushes him, tho' he endanger the overturning the Cart. But different Parties will Watch over, Balance, and be a Check on each other, that they don't vent Seditious Principles, nor break out into Rebellious Practices. And a sober Christian, tho' he choose to be a Stated Member of one Church, yet may own others for true Churches of Christ, and Occasionally Communicate with 'em as such, on the account of their Agreement in the Essentials of a Church; but yet not own their Imperfections; nor prove a fiery Zealot either for or against any of those lesser or doubtful Matters, in which they differ from each other; and wherein, for ought I can see, Learned and Pious Men will be of contrary Perswasions.

I have but one thing more to offer on this Head; and 'tis the Example of the Apostle *Paul*, who, when he came to *Jerusalem*, by the Advice of *James* and all the Elders makes a Vow, Purifies himself, Shaves his Head, and goes into the Temple to make his Offering there. Thus

Acts 21:
18:
20.

did he observe the Ceremonies of the *National Church* establisht by *Law*, tho' at that time they were of no more value than the *Hairs* that he cut off: or the pieces of *Leather* which the *Dutch* are said to have paid away for Money, that had no *intrinsic Worth* in 'em, nothing but the Stamp of *Humane Authority* to recommend 'em: Which is as much as can be said of any Ceremonies among us.

V. 22. And this he did for fear of the *Multitude*, and to satisfy them, that tho he Preached against the *Gentiles* Observation of these Rites, yet that he himself upon occasion *walk'd Orderly, and kept the Law*; i. e. when he was among them, he behaved himself like a thorough Conformist.

V. 21. Had our Casuist been by, he would have Chastiz'd *St. Paul* and all his Advisers; and have told 'em this was *serv'ing of a Secular End*; and for the Apostle to be *contrary to himself*, to Communicate with them who were flaming hot on one side for Ceremonies, and on the other against them; that this was *directly contrary to all the Principles of Church-Communion*; and would have been ready to joyn with the *Jews of Asia*, and have laid hands upon him,

V. 27.

But

But, after all, I don't think that Saint Paul look'd on himself as obliged here-upon to live in constant Communion with the National Church of the Jews, and renounce the Christian Assemblies as Schismatical Conventicles. His Practice was a plain Confutation of this Dictate of our Author, that *Constant Communion is a necessary Duty, where Occasional Communion is Lawful.*

CHAP. VIII.

Though it should be supposed that we are justly chargeable with Schism from the Church of England; yet we are not Schismatics from the Catholick Church: Proved by the Judgment and Reasons of the greatest Divines of the Church; and among others of Dr. Sherlock himself. And by the Law of several Christian Emperors.

I Will, for the present, not *grant*, but *suppose*, for Disputation's sake, that we are justly chargeable with Schism from the Church of England; yet, thence

it will not follow that we are *Schismaticks* from the *Catholick Church*: Which I will prove from the Sayings and Reasons too of some of the greatest Prelatical Divines, and such who can't be suppos'd to be biassed with any partial Respect to Dissenters. The great Hooker tells us, *The Unity of the visible Body and Church of Christ, consists in that Uniformity which all the severall Persons thereto belonging have, by reason of that One Lord whose Servants they all profess themselves, that One Faith which they all acknowledge, that One Baptism wherewith they are all initiated.*

Eccles. Polity, L. 3. p. 126. Edit. 1676. The visible Church of Christ is therefore One in Outward Profession of these things, which supernaturally appertain to the very Essence of Christianity. — In whomsoever these things are, the Church doth acknowledge them for her Children; them Only she holdeth for Aliens and Strangers in whom these things are not found. For want of these it is that Saracens, Jews and Infidels are excluded out of the Bounds of the Church.

P. 127.

But what if they are *Schismaticks* from a particular Church? Do they then cease to be Members of the *Catholick Church*? No; for he immediately adds, *Others we may not deny to be of the visible Church as long as These things are not wanting*

ing in them. For apparent it is, that all Men are of Necessity either Christians, or not Christians. If by External Profession they be Christians, then are they of the visible Church of Christ; and Christians by External Profession they are All, whose Mark of Recognisance hath in it these things which we have mention'd (which are one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism); yea, altho' they be impious Idolaters, wicked Hereticks, Persons excommunicable, yea, and cast out for Notorious Improbability. After this, he blames the Arguments of Cyprian and others, who were so warm for re-baptizing those who had been Baptized by Hereticks, because Hereticks are not in the Church; and tells us, *All that they* Pag. 127,
said was not sufficient to prove, that Here- 128.
ticks (who generally are Schismatics, and such did he esteem those there spoken of) *were in no sort any part of the visible Church of Christ, and consequently their* P. 129.
Baptism no Baptism. And he embraces the Saying of the College of Geneva, viz. *That Men remain in the visible Church 'till they utterly renounce the Profession of Christianity.* The contrary hereunto (which Dr. Sherlock hath taught us) he condemns as a Popish Notion.

P. 130.

The

*Just Vind.
of the Ch.
of Engl.
p. 55.*

The Learned A. B. *Bramhal* too condemns the Doctrine of *Knot* the Jesuite, (against whom *Chillingworth* wrote)

“ That the Parts of the Church cannot
 “ be divided one from another, except
 “ they be divided from the whole, because those things, which are united
 “ to one Third, are united also between
 “ themselves: *Which Error*, says the
 “ Bishop, *he would seem to have suck’d*
 “ *from Dr. Potter, whom he either would*
 “ *not, or at least did not understand,* that
 “ whosoever professeth himself to forsake the Communion of any one Member of the Body of Christ, must confess himself consequently to forsake
 “ the whole. *Of which*, says the Bishop, *he makes this Use, That Protestants forsake the Communion of the Church of Rome; and yet do confess it to be a Member of the Body of Christ; therefore they forsake the Communion of the whole Church.* By the way, hence the Reader may learn from whom, viz. *Knot* the Jesuite, our Learned Doctor, and others, have borrow’d their Marking Iron, wherewith they brand us in the Cheek for Heathens. Now, says the Bishop, *the Answer is easy, that whosoever doth separate himself from any part of the Catholick Church, as it is a Part of the Catholick Church, doth separate himself*

himself from every part of the Catholick Church, and consequently from the Universal Church, which hath no Existence but in its Parts. But if one Part of the Universal Church do separate it self from another part, not Absolutely and in Essentials (and what they are Mr. Hooker told us before, viz. one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism); but Respectively in Abuses and Innovations; not as it is a part of the Universal Church, but only so far as it is corrupted and degenerated; it doth still retain a Communion, not only with the Catholick Church, and all Orthodox Members of the Catholick Church; but even with that corrupted Church from which it is separated; except only in Corruptions. Seeing, therefore tho' it should be supposed (for we do but suppose it) that we are Schismatics from the Particular Church of England, yet we do not separate from her, As she is a Part of the Catholick Church, (for we profess to own the same Lord, the same Faith, the same Baptism, which are the very things that make her a Part of the Catholick Church) we still have Communion in those Essential things with her, and with the whole Catholick Church; and therefore must be acknowledged still to be Members of the Catholick Church: Yea, even by those who think

think we do Schismatically break the External Communion of the Church of England.

Again, says the same Bishop [*], *I know some Roman Catholicks have doubted and suspended their Judgments, whether Schismatics be still Members of the Catholick Church; others have determined that they are: And we are of the same Mind, that in part they do remain still coupled and mortised to the Church; that is, in those things wherein they have made no Separation; ex ea parte in texturæ compage detinentur, in cœtera scissi sunt. And that in this respect, the Catholick Church by their Baptism doth beget Sons and Daughters to God. And we think we have St. Austin in this for us, Una est Ecclesia, &c.*

The next Author I shall quote is Dr. Clagget.

He tells us [†], *All that is absolutely necessary to the Being of a Church, is acknowledgment of one Lord, profession of one Faith, and admission by one Baptism; and therefore, so far as Unity in these things does spread and obtain in the World, (and I assure*

[*] A. B. Bramhall's *Just Vindic. of the Church of England* Disc. 3d, p. 169.

[†] *Notes of the Church*, p. 166. Mr. Gee tells us, That He is the Author of that Discourse.

sure the Reader, they have and do obtain among Us) *so far, and no further, is the Body of the Church propagated, because 'tis One by this Unity. — And because the* ^{p. 167.} *Church of Rome holds these three, we according to Truth allow her to be a Part of the Catholick Church. Now we hope Dr. Sherlock will be as Gracious to his Protestant Dissenting Brethren and their Churches, especially when he cannot deny but that they have these 3 things among 'em. We the rather expect it, because Dr. Clagget adds, speaking of the Church of England, She doth not unchurch* ^{p. 168.} *those parts of Christendom that hold the Unity of the Faith; no, not that Church it self, the Church of Rome, which hath added thereto so many enormous Innovations. We desire the eager Sons of the Church, to use the milder Language of their Mother, and not to unchurch and unchristian us who hold the Unity of the Faith without any enormous Innovations.*

Well, but tho' we have one Lord, Hope and Faith, Baptism, God and Father of all; yet if we don't keep, but break the External Communion of the Church, will not that undo all again? No: For Dr. Sherlock tells us, *That tho' Christians are not One entire Communion, but Divide and Separate from each other,* which

which we will grant is a very great Fault ; yet if they Communicate in such (forementioned) things as make One Church, whatever their other Divisions are, they are One Church still ; their Quarrels and Divisions may hurt themselves. But do they hurt themselves thereby so far as to cut off Themselves, or one another from the Catholick Church ? No, for he immediately adds, ‘ But cannot destroy the Unity of the Church : For the Church is one Body, not meerly by the Unity and Agreement of Christians among themselves ; but by the Appointment and Institution of Christ, who has made all those who profess the true Faith, and are united in the same Sacraments, to belong to the same Body, to be His One Body. And therefore (*let the Reader observe*) Christians are never exhorted to be One Body ; for that they are, if they be Christians, as the Apostle expressly asserts, that Christians are but One Body ; but they are exhorted to live in Unity and Concord, because they are but One Body.

Again

(a) *Vindication of the Discourse concerning the Notes of the Church,* p. 22. Mr. Gee tells us, That Dr. Sherlock is the Author of this Discourse.

Again. Having quoted that of the pag. 23.
 Apostle, ' That there should be no
 ' Schism in the Body, but that the Mem-
 ' bers should have the same Care one for
 ' another. *He immediately says :* ' But
 ' suppose Christians have not this mu-
 ' tual Care one of another ; do they
 ' cease to be Members of the same Body ?
 ' *He answers,* No such matter : These
 ' Quarrels between the Members of the
 ' same Body are very Unnatural ; but
 ' they are the same Body still. If the
 ' Foot shall say, Because I am not the
 ' Hand, I am not of the Body ; is it
 ' therefore not of the Body ? And if
 ' the Ear shall say, Because I am not the
 ' Eye, I am not of the Body ; is it
 ' therefore not of the Body ? That is,
 ' tho' the Members of the same Body out
 ' of Discontent, Envy and Emulation,
 ' should separate from each other, and
 ' deny that they belong to the same Body,
 ' yet they are of the Body still.

A little after, says he, ' The whole
 ' Christian Church is the One Mystical
 ' Body of Christ, united to him by
 ' Faith and Baptism, notwithstanding
 ' all the Divisions of Christendom.

A little after he adds, ' To know pag. 26.
 ' whether any Church be a true Church,
 ' we must not so much enquire whom
 ' they

‘ they *Communicate* with, or *Separate*
 ‘ from, but what their Faith and Wor-
 ‘ ship is.——All the Christian Churches
 ‘ in the World that retain the true Faith
 ‘ and Worship of Christ, tho’ they are
 ‘ *divided from each other* upon the Dis-
 ‘ putes of *Faith*, or *Worship*, or *Disci-*
 ‘ *pline*, are yet the One Church of *Christ*,
 ‘ as being united in the *Essentials* of
 ‘ Faith and Worship, which by the In-
 ‘ stitution of Christ makes them his One
 ‘ Mystical Body and One Church.

pag. 27.

Yet once more. ‘ Schism is not tear-
 ‘ ing off a part of the Church ; but one
 ‘ part dividing from the other in Exter-
 ‘ nal Communion ; which supposes that
 ‘ *both Parts* still belong to the *same*
 ‘ Church, or else the Church is not divi-
 ‘ ded. For *Apostacy* and *Schism* are two
 ‘ different things : *Apostates* cease to be
 ‘ of the Church ; *Schismaticks* are of the
 ‘ Church still, tho’ they disturb the
 ‘ Peace of the Church, and divide the
 ‘ External Communion of it ; which
 ‘ differ as forsaking the Church and go-
 ‘ ing out of it (which *no Man* does,
 ‘ who does not *renounce the Faith of*
 ‘ *Christ*) and raising Quarrels and Con-
 ‘ tentions in it to the alienating of *Chri-*
 ‘ *tians* from each other.

Now

Now let him, who can reconcile Light and Darknes, try his Skill to reconcile what I have here transcribed out of the Doctor (and others) with what he himself tells us in the Abridgment, viz. ^{Abridgm.} ' I have nothing else to do but to consider, ^{p. 19. 20. wards the} ' whether that part of the Catholick ^{bottom.} Church wherein I live, be so sound that I may lawfully live in Communion with it; and if it be, I am bound to do so under Peril of Schism from the Catholick Church. And again. ' That ^{Case p. 43. Abridgm.} ' Man that Separates from such a Sound ^{p. 27.} Part of the Church, Separates from the whole Church; for this mighty Reason, ' Because (forsooth) the Communion of ' the Church is but one.

These are not Passages dropt on the by, but some of the main Stamina of his Discourse. This is the Sandy Foundation of his cruel Sentence against us, That we have forfeited our Interest in the ^{P. 17. 18.} Covenant of Grace, and have no Right to the Blessings of it; for they are confin'd to the Catholick Church, from which we poor Creatures are broken off, because we don't live in Constant Communion with the Church of England! And this is his great Medium, to prove, that Constant Communion is a Necessary Duty, where Occasional Communion is Lawful; and the

great Step on which he advances his beloved Assertion, That 'tis Necessary to continue in Constant Communion with the Establish'd Church of *England*: Which he thus triumphantly brings in;

p. 28.

' Now if these things be true, which I have so plainly prov'd, then it will easily be made appear, &c. Whereas he has plainly prov'd nothing, but that he can Contradict himself as well as the Truth, and the most famous Divines of his own Church. His very Subject is Contagious to him; he has written so long about *SCHISM*, that he is the furthest of any Man alive from *Unity with himself*. 'Tis Natural for every Man to imitate the Object which he adores. This Doctor hath made to himself a God of *Three Minds*; 'tis no wonder if we often find him of *Two*.

Besides these Great Clergymen, I shall produce Three Emperors, as Vouchers for *Us*, viz. *Gratian*, *Valentinian*, and *Theodosius*; to whom I may add the Emperor *Justinian*, as a Fourth: For he has confirm'd, and put into his *Code*, that Law of theirs, wherein they command all their Subjects, to follow that Religion which the Apostle *Peter* deliver'd to the Church of *Rome*, and which Pope *Damasus*, and *Peter* of *Alexandria*, did fol-

Cod. Just.
L. 1. de
Summa
Trinit. &c.
Tit. 1.
Cunctos
Populos,
&c.

follow : *i. e.* That they believe the Trinity according to the Apostolical and Evangelical Doctrine : And they require, that all who do so, shall embrace the Name of *Christian Catholicks* ; but all others, they brand as Mad, Wild *Hereticks*, fit to be destroy'd by God and Man. Op. Tom. 4. p. 42. Edit. Erasmi.
 Now St. *Jerom* tells us what *Damasus's* Faith was as to this Particular ; and *Pe-ter's* of *Alexandria* may be seen also ; Trip. Hist. L. 7. C. 37. L. 8. C. 14.
 both of which, I suppose, will be allow'd to be Orthodox Ones. And if Soundness in the Doctrine of the Trinity, be the Test of Mens being *Christian Catholicks*, WE shall come off well enough ; but the Doctor had need to look about him.

CHAP. IX.

That We are not guilty of Schism from the Church of England. The Point Stated. This inferr'd from the foregoing Chapter. The very hard Case of our Ministers, whom the People can't forsake without Sin. The Conformists gather'd Churches out of Churches. Our Departure not Voluntary; but We are forced away by their Canons. Of their Want of Discipline, and Opposition to it by a Prevailing Party among 'em.

A Defensive War, naturally draws on an Offensive one. He who is vigorously attack'd, will not be long able to preserve himself from receiving a Wound, without giving one to him who so warmly pushes at him, and presses hard upon him. If therefore I make some Passes which I would have avoided, if I could, and in making which I
take

take no delight ; this, with all reasonable Men, will be a just Apology, that Self-Defence is necessary ; and Necessity has no Law, or rather is the Supreme One.

That we may not keep at Arms length, but speedily close, I will premise a few things, which I believe will not be opposed.

1. That 'tis our *not holding* External Communion with the Church of *England* for which we are Condemn'd as *guilty of Schism*.

2. That a Total and Constant Communion with that Church, at all Times, and in all Acts of Worship, exclusively of all others, is thought necessary to free us from that Imputation. *Occasional* Communion, Dr. *Sherlock* tells us, is *no Communion* ; and if we should Occasionally Communicate with Her, only at some Times, and in some Acts of Worship, but fixedly Communicate with any other Church of *English-men* in *England*, whether *Presbyterian* or *Independent* ; we are charged, not only as *Schismaticks*, but as *Hypocrites* too ; and contrary to our *Selves*, as well as to our *Brethren*.

See for this
Dr. Stil-
lingf. Unr.
of Separ.
p. 161.

Yea if it be not *Total*, in all Acts of
Worship, as well as *Constant*, We are
accused as *Schismatics* still.

3. That Causeless, Voluntary Separation from, or Not communicating with a Church, whereof we either *de Facto* are, or *de jure* are bound to be Members, is one sort of *Schism*.

4. That Uncharitableness is one Ingredient in *Schism*: Yea, the Venom of *Schism* lies in *that*. For *Herefy* is opposed to *Faith*, but *Schism* to *Love*. And there were *Schisms* in the Church of *Corinth*, in those Men who *did not* break *External Communion*.

These things being premised, I shall endeavour to prove, That We are *not* *Schismatics* from the Church of *England*.
Now,

1st. I might argue, with the Doctor on *his own* Principle, which is this, That every Man in this Nation, who is a *Schismatick* from the Church of *England*, is a *Schismatick* from the *Catholick Church*. This he asserts, over and over. But We are *not* *Schismatics* from the *Catholick Church*, as I have prov'd in the foregoing Chapter: Whence it naturally follows, that

that We *are not* Schismatics from the Church of England.

But 2dly. I urge the *very hard Case* of Our Ministers, with respect to the *Act of Uniformity*. Here I shall speak to these *Two Points*.

1st. The *Unreasonable and Strange Terms* required of them, for Non-Compliance wherewith, they were *Ejected* several Years ago; and they, with others who succeed them, are still in like manner *kept out*.

2dly. That 'tis *Sinful* for the People to *desert* Them, and *join* in Constant, Total Communion with our Brethren of the Church of England, who have *complied with those Terms*.

(1.) The *Unreasonable and Strange Terms* required of our Ministers, for Non-Compliance where with, they were *Ejected* several Years ago; and they, with others who succeed them, are still in like manner *kept out*. If they would Conform, they must own *Bishops* as an Order (by Divine Right) *Superiour* to *Presbyters*; which the *Old Church of England* did neither Require nor Believe. By *these* Bishops they must

be *Re-ordain'd* ; whereas they might as well be *Re-baptiz'd*. This is in effect to acknowledge, that hitherto they have been *Usurpers*, and throw Dirt on all their former Publick Ministrations. This is not required (as some pretend) meerly to qualify them for the *Exercise* of their Ministry in the Church of England ; for the Words of the *Liturgy* say, That they

*The Collect
for the Or-
dering of
Priests.*

are now called to the *Office of Priest-hood*. And again, when Hands are laid on them, says the Bishop ; *Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, NOW committed to thee.* 'Tis in the Church of GOD, not in the Church of England only : And the *Office of Priesthood* they are called to, not admitted to the meer *Exercise* of it.

They must declare their *Assent* and *Consent* to all things in the *Liturgy* ; Swear Obedience to the Bishops according to the *Canons* ; (and what some of them are, the Reader shall have an Account by and by.) They must use the dedicating Sign of the Cross in Baptism ; and otherwise refuse to Baptize any ; and so they must, unless God-fathers and God-mothers be procured, while the Parents must stand by, as tho' they were not concern'd : They must deny the Lord's Supper to all that will not take it Kneeling. To do which two last things, is to clog Christ's
Ordi-

Ordinances with *new Terms* of Communion. They must in effect say, all that are Buried are Saved, except only Unbaptized and Excommunicated Persons and Self-Murderers. Whereas many Canonical Chapters are omitted, they must in time of Divine Service read several Lessons out of the *Apocrypha* for the Instruction of the People; and among the rest, that very strange Story (which is contained in the Lessons for the last Day of *Sept.* and the 1st. of *Octob.*) about the Devil *Asmodeus*, who by burning the Heart and Liver of a Fish was forc'd to scour away into the remotest Parts of *Egypt*, and leave *Tobias* to the free and full Liberty of enjoying his new married Wife: And on *Nov.* the 23. the Legend of *Bell and the Dragon*, which was put in at the last Reformation of the Common-Prayer Book by the Commissioners at the *Savoy*. Now we are at a loss how these tend to the *Edification* of the People.

They must Excommunicate whomsoever a *Lay-Chancellor* bids 'em, though they know nothing of the Matter, or know it to be for Trifles, and that they are some of the best Men in the Parish. They were to renounce the Covenant, for themselves and every Body else, tho' the King took it in *Scotland*: Which
Re-

Renunciation is now indeed no longer required, but was so 'till the Year 1682, by which time they hoped the Heads of our Reverend Fathers would be laid; and which was one Cause of their Non-conformity. They must also subscribe this Declaration, *That 'tis not Lawful upon ANY pretence whatsoever to take Arms against the King, and that they abhor that Traiterous Position of taking Arms by his Authority against his Person, or those that are Commissionated by him:* Which contains such Propositions as the Lords themselves afterwards upon Debate about the Bill of the Test (into which these Expressions were inserted) were forced to alter, and could not justify in those words.

The Letter about the Test. in State-Tracts, V. 1. p. 37.

Dr. Bates speaking of the King's Declaration about Ecclesiastical Affairs, says, *If it had been observed, it had prevented the doleful Division which succeeded afterwards.* But when there was a Motion made in the House of Commons, that the Declaration might pass into an Act, it was opposed by one of the Secretaries of State, which was a sufficient Indication of the King's Averseness to it. After the Declaration, there were many Conferences at the Savoy between the Bishops and some Doctors of their Party with Mr. Baxter, and some other Ministers, for an Agreement wherein his

His Sermon at Mr. Baxter's Fun. p. 97, 98.

his Zeal for Peace was most Conspicuous:
But all was in vain. Of the Particulars
that were Debated, he has given an Ac-
count in Print. Again, The Bishops would
not bear of having so much as the Coun-
sel and Consent of Presbyters in the Exer-
cise of Church Power. This was to un-Bi-
shop 'em. The Doctor, who was not
wont to give hard words, (and who be-
ing one of the Presbyterian Ministers that
manag'd the Savoy-Conference, knew
too well the Truth of what he says)
 further adds, ' In the Year 1661, a Pag. 101.
 ' Parliament was called, wherein was
 ' pass'd the Act of Uniformity, that ex-
 ' pell'd from their Publick Places about
 ' 2000 Ministers. I will only take No-
 ' tice concerning the Causes of that Pro-
 ' ceeding; that the Old Clergy, from
 ' Wrath and Revenge; and the Young
 ' Gentry from their servile Compliance
 ' with the Court, and their Dislike of
 ' serious Religion, were very Active to
 ' carry on and compleat that Act. That
 ' this is no rash Imputation upon the ru-
 ' ling Clergy then, is evident, not only
 ' from their Concurrence in passing that
 ' Law, (for Actions have a Language
 ' as convincing as that of Words) but
 ' from Dr. Sheldon, then Bishop of Lon-
 ' don, their great Leader; who, when
 ' the

' the Lord Chamberlain *Manchester* told
 ' the King, while the Act of Uniformi-
 ' ty was under Debate, *That he was afraid*
 ' *the Terms of it were so rigid, that many*
 ' *of the Ministers would not comply with it;*
 ' He reply'd, *I am afraid they will.* This
 ' Act was pass'd after the King had en-
 ' gag'd his Faith and Honour in his De-
 ' claration from *Breda*, *To preserve the*
 ' *Liberty of Conscience inviolate;* which
 ' Promise open'd the way for his Resto-
 ' ration; and after the Royalists here
 ' had given publick Assurance, that all
 ' former Animosities should be buried as
 ' Rubbish under the Foundation of an
 ' Universal Concord.

I will add the words of another wor-
 thy Person on this occasion; ' That Bar-
 ' tholomew - Day (on which they were
 turn'd out, who by that time did not
 submit to these Terms of Conformity)
 ' was Fatal to our Church and Religion,
 ' in throwing out a very great number
 ' of Worthy, Learned, Pious and Or-
 ' thodox Divines, who could not come
 ' up to this and other things in that Act:
 ' And so great was the Zeal in carrying
 ' on this Church Affair; and so blind
 ' was the Obedience required, that if you
 ' compute the time of the passing this
 ' Act with the time allow'd for the Cler-
 ' gy

Let. about
 the Test
 Bill in
 State-
 Tracts.
 Vol. 1. pag.
 41, 42.

' gy to subscribe the Book of *Common-*
 ' *Prayer* thereby *Establiſh'd*; you ſhall
 ' plainly find it could not be Printed and
 ' Distributed ſo, as one Man in forty
 ' could have ſeen and read the Book they Ib. p. 131
 ' did ſo perfectly aſſent and conſent unto.
 On which he makes ſo ſevere a Reflection,
 on, that I am not willing to tranſcribe.

Theſe are ſome of the things required
 of our Miniſters; who in the Year 1660
 had been by Act of Parliament *declared* See the
and adjudged to have been, be, and conti- Act Anno
nue the real Lawful Incumbents, Parsons, 12. Caro-
Reſtors, Vicars, and Poſſeſſors of their Be- li 2di, Ch,
nefices to all Intents and Purpoſes; 17. and
 they were ſo confirm'd, becauſe that did
much conduce (as the words of the Act
are) *to the Peace and Welfare of this Church*
and Kingdom. Yet, afterwards, they
 were turn'd out and Depriv'd by
 the Act of Uniformity. Whereupon,
 many of their People deſerted them, and
 repaired to the New Teachers, who in
 truth were the Separatiſts, and gather'd
Churches out of Churches; for they had no
 other Sheep but what they got away from
 their Old Paſtors: Who adher'd to as
 many of their Flock as ſtuck to them.
 They thought it their Duty not to deſert
 the Miniſtry, to which they had been ſo
 ſolemnly Ordain'd, nor could the Rela-
tion

tion between them and their People be thus dissolv'd: They who deserted them Sinned in so doing, and they that stuck to 'em did their Duty. So do they who attend on the Ministry of as many of 'em as are yet alive, and of those who having Scriptural Ordination do succeed 'em, and are kept out from the Legal Establishment by the same Act. But this brings me to the

(2.) Point. To shew 'tis *Sinful* for the People to *desert* them, and *join* in Constant, Total Communion with our Brethren of the Church of *England*, who have complied with those Terms. Oppression and Tyranny have been wont in the Church of God, to be esteem'd a Just Cause of refusing to join in Communion with those who have been guilty of 'em. A considerable number of the Inhabitants of *Constantinople*, after the unjust Deposition and Banishment of *John Chrysostom* (who were called *Joannites*, for their stiffly adhering to him) would not Communicate with his Successor, because they had just Reason to dislike the undue Proceedings in that Affair. *They could not be charm'd* (as a late Depriv'd Bishop expresses it) *with the Saintship of any second Bishop during his Life; nor frighted with the Irresistible Power of the Emperor* which

Socrates H.
E. L. 6. C.
38.

which was let loose upon them, to make them own the Second Bishop he had set up *. When *Liberius*, Bishop of Rome in the 4th Century, was banisht thence for his steady Adherence to the Orthodox Faith, all the Clergy, i. e. the Presbyters, and Arch-Deacon *Felix*, and *Damasus* himself the Deacon, and † all the Officers of the Church in presence of the Roman People bound themselves by an Oath, that they would by no means have another Bishop as long as *Liberius* was alive. The Clergy broke this Oath, and set up Arch-Deacon *Felix* in his room. Which Act of theirs displeased all the People. And they shewed their Dislike of this Second Bishop and his perjur'd Clergy, by refusing to make a Procession (b) with him (which it was the manner (c) of those Times to make with great Pomp upon the Choice of a Bishop) whereby they publickly disown'd him.

* Case of the Regale and Pontif. p. 78. 'Tis the 1st. of those Leaves that are so paged; For by the Negligence of the Printer we have those Numbers at the top of the Pages twice over.

† The Preface to *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus's* *Libellus Precum*, or Humble Supplication to the Emperors, *Valentinian*, *Theodosius*, and *Arcadius*; *Faustini Opera*. Edit. Oxon. Anno 1678.

(a) *Cuncta Ecclesie Officia*.

(b) *Quod actum universo Populo displicuit, & se ab ejus Processione suspendit.*

(c) Annot. on these words at the end of *Faustini Opera*.

him. Three Years after, when their Old Bishop *Liberius* return'd, the People went joyfully out of the City to meet him, and *Felix* was chased away; who in a little while after, by the earnest Perswasion of his perjured Clergymen, breaks into *Rome*; whereupon (a) *the whole multitude of the Faithful*, and the Nobility, again very disgracefully drive him away. After the Death of both *Liberius* and *Felix*, (which happen'd pretty near together) the Presbyters and Deacons, with the (b) *Holy People of Liberius's* his Party chose *Ursinus* in his room; but those of *Felix's* Faction chose *Damasus*; who hired the Rabble to fall on *Ursinus's* Party, and madly made a great Slaughter of 'em for three Days together. After this he procured *Ursinus* to be Banisht, together with the Deacons *Aman-tius* and *Lupus*, and design'd as much against Seven Presbyters, who were Imprison'd; but the (c) *Faithful People* set them at Liberty: And the People would not accompany *Damasus* in his *Procession*, for which they were severely drub'd, and some of 'em kill'd. When they were met together, *Damasus* with the Rabble again, and the (d) *whole Clergy* Besieg'd 'em in the Church, broke in upon 'em, murder'd 160 Men and Women downright,

(a) Omnis
multitudo
Fidelium,
& Proce-
res.

(b) Cum
plebe San-
cta.

(c) Plebs
Fidelis.

(d) Om-
nem Cle-
rum.

right, many others after dying of the Wounds they receiv'd there. It seems there were no less than Five of these Assaults (a) that they endured. All which did not discourage 'em, but they often met together repeating the words of our Saviour, against *Damasus*: *Fear not them that kill the Body, &c.* and singing that Psalm; *The dead Bodies of thy Saints have they given as Meat to the Fowls, &c.* When *Ursinus* was recalled, the *Holy People* (b) joyfully met him. Upon his being Banisht again, the *People fearing God*, (c) and not tired out by all these *Persecutions*, were not afraid either of the *Emperor* or the *Judge*, but kept Religious Assemblies, without any *Clergy* among 'em; for which many of them were killed upon the Spot. So firmly did they stick to their old *Bishop*, in defiance to a new one, though he had got the *Clergy* on his side too.

The Author of the History of the *Regale* tells us, (which will save me the trouble of adding more Instances) That the refusing to *Communicate* with them who step into the room of *Bishops unjustly Deprived*,
I has

(a) Quintum jam Bellum Damasus fecit.

(b) Plebs Sancta gratanter occurrit.

(c) Sed Populus timens Deum, nulliq; Persecutionib' fatigatus non Imperatorem, non Judicem ---- timuit, sed per coemeteria Martyrum Stationes sine Clericis celebrabat.

has been the Practice not only of Single Per-
sons, but Churches, nay of the whole Ca-
tholick Church. And besides Examples,
 the same Ingenious and Learned Man
 produces strong Reasons, That no Au-
 thority less than that which gives any
 Commission, can stop the *Execution* of
 it : For otherwise they might render it
ineffectual and *vacate* it ; and all *States*
 having equal Authority within their own
 Dominions, they might as well have sus-
 pended and vacated the *Apostolical*
 Commission, as any *State* dissolve the
 Relation between a Bishop and his parti-
 cular Flock. That 'tis more unreasona-
 ble to suppose the *State* can by any un-
 just Deprivation, disable him from exe-
 cuting his Office in the *Place* whereto he
 is appointed, than in any other. For he
 has more Right to that *Place*, to that
 particular Flock over which he is appoin-
 ted, and to exercise his Office *there*, than
 in any other Place. And the Secular Ma-
 gistrate may as well destroy the whole
 Authority of the Church of Christ. To
 which he might have added, that 'tis *Sa-*
criledge unjustly to alienate Holy Persons
 who are dedicated to God's Special Ser-
 vice : And a much worse sort of Sacri-
 ledge to rob the Church of about 2000
 Pious and Able Ministers, and many of
 'em very Learned Ones too ; than to steal
 away

Case of the
 Regale and
 Pontif. p.
 79.

P. 2, 3.

P. 45.

away a Surplice, or pilfer an Altar of any of its Utensils. Indeed he does say somewhat that looks this way on a Point that nearly borders on this in hand. And 'tis *Sinful in the People* to countenance such Practices as these, which draw such sad Consequences after 'em, by running to these Second Bishops, and deserting the First Set, who are unrighteously thrust out. These are the good old *Presbyterian* Arguments, which they urged against the ejecting of their Ministers by the Act of Uniformity; tho' I do not think they are valid in the Case of our *Non-jurors*, who are open, professed Enemies to his Majesty's Person and Government: Whereas our Ministers were ready to give the State all Reasonable Security for their Loyalty. And as for the present Government, there's none that can pretend to be more Loyal to it than We are. We shall always be in Love with our Constitution, *King, Lords and Commons*. We, in our Hearts, believe his present Majesty (whom God long preserve) has the *best Title* of any Prince in the World. The distinction of *de Facto* and *de Jure* in His Case, was not coined by us, nor does it pass among us. We acknowledge him to be (and, if I mistake not, we were the first that in

*Preface to
the Case of
the Regale,
p. 7.*

our Addressees did call Him) our *Lawful*
and *Rightful* SOVERAIGN.

The same Reasons against the *Magistrate's* doing this, will hold against a *Bishop's* or a *Convocation's* doing it too; and are as good, yea, it may be better, in the Case of *Presbyters*, than that of *Bishops*.

Dr. *Stillingsfleet* indeed does reflect upon us, as not dealing very fairly in not letting the People understand the Terms of *Lay-Conformity*. We reply, This is a Mistake; and that the *Conforming Ministers* are, as we think, at least as much to blame, in not being willing to let them understand the Terms of *Ministerial Conformity*. This that most Able Man prudently waved; and so does our

Abridgm. *Abridger*, saying, 'Tis not to My Purpose.
p. 21. But I hope my Readers will begin to think 'tis somewhat to the Purpose, tho' it may be not to His. And seeing he adds, That Matter may easily be made out; I can assure Dr. *Sherlock*, that we are willing to join Issue on that Head, and might, (we think) safely venture the whole Charge of *Schism* upon it.

I might further enforce this Argument, by considering the Scheme of some of the greatest Men of the Church, about an *uninterrupted Succession*, &c. whereby

whereby they offer a Handle to us to call in Question the Validity of ~~their~~ Ordinations, if we delighted in such Work. Tho' the bold Insulting of ~~ours~~ if it be continu'd, may provoke a Man to do what he is not fond of. At this time I shall only say, That one of 'em quotes the *Apostolical Canons* (as they are called) and a great many Councils, to prove, That 'tis made *Excommunication* and *Deprivation* to Appeal from the Bishop to the King, or any Secular Power, in Ecclesiastical Causes. Or for any Bishop to be made not only by the King's Command; but if he make use of the Interest or Recommendation of Secular Princes, or obtain his Bishoprick by their Means. He might have added, All they are *Excommunicated* who do Communicate with 'em. These Councils, he tells us, are received in the Church of England; and they are the best Expositors we can have of the Apostolical Canons. Now we know that Appeals in England are made to our Kings, whom out of his abundant Reverence to his Majesty he calls *Hermaphrodites*. And no Man need to be told of *Conge d' eslires*, or by whom our Bishops are promoted. But we are not willing, unless we are further urg'd, to shake the Reputation of their Orders, and so lessen their Usefulness

*Hist. of the
Regale &
Pontif. p.
101, 102.*

*Supplem. to
the Case p.
85.*

Case p. 222

ness among those of their own Perswasion. I proceed to a

- 3d Argument, to prove that We are not guilty of *Schism*, viz. Our Departure from the Church of England is not *Voluntary*, but we are driven away by her severe *Canons*, which were on purpose made and directed against us. All are declared *ipso Facto* Excommunicated, who
- Can. 5. shall affirm that the Form of Worship contained in the Book of Common-Prayer is a Corrupt, Superstitious, or Unlawful Worship, or contains *ANY* thing in it repugnant to the Scriptures. This cuts off all who are against the Cross in Baptism. Or that *ANY* of the 39 Articles are in any part erroneous, or such as he may not with a good Conscience subscribe unto: Tho' they know we affirm this of 3 of 'em,
- Can. 6. Or say the like of their Rites and Ceremonies, or that we may not with any good Conscience use or approve 'em: I need not say what our Judgment is of Them: Or
- Can. 7. affirm that their Government by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, and the *REST* that bear Office in the same, is Anti-Christian or repugnant to the Word of God: Tho' we do say this of Lay-Chancellors,
- Can. 8. Or affirm their Form of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests, or Deacons,

cons, contains ANY thing in it repugnant to the Word of God. Tho' we can find no such Bishop, nor no such Deacon in the Scriptures as they make. And such Changes there are in these Forms from what formerly they were, that they seem to degrade the Parish Minister into a meer Curate, or a half Presbyter, and make the Bishop the only Pastor.

Here is nothing of Reproaching, or Obstinacy mention'd ; but whosoever shall affirm so or so : And he is not to be restored'till he Repent, and publickly revoke these wicked Errors ; there's no mention of previous Admonitions ; and if there were, a Man can't change his settled Judgment as easily as the Wind shifts its corner. And these wicked Errors, as they call'em, a very good Man may run into seeing such plausible Arguments at least may be offer'd for'em. Witness the profound and acute Mr. Jeans, who had formerly printed in Defence of the Ceremonies of the Church : And because the Complaints ran High against them afterwards, fell afresh on Studying that Point with a Design of further Vindicating'em : But reading the Nonconformists Books, he wrote against the Ceremonies, and at large confuted what he had formerly Publish'd for'em : Consideration quick-

*His mixture of
Scholast. &
Pract. Divinity, V.
2. P. 24.*

ly produced an Alteration in his Judgment, and saith he, ' I believe it will do so too in all that will make such an impartial Search into the Matter as I have done. So severe a Sentence for so small a Crime as to affirm A N Y of these to be unlawful, if the Church pretended to *Infallibility*, would not be Justifiable; much less for no Crime; but for a great Truth, as we think in the Case of the *Cross* and *Lay-Chancellors*, &c. Christ never put the Sword of Excommunication into the Hands of Church Rulers, to lay about 'em at this rate. 'Tis yet worse if that be true which Dr. *Sherlock* says in Defence of the Passages we except against in the Office of Burial, where speaking of the *Ipsa Facto* Excommunications for such Offences as are specified in

Disc. of the Canons; he tells us, ' That if a Minister by any Means finds any Man under this Sentence, tho' not actually inflicted on him by an Ecclesiastical Judge; yet he may by vertue of this Rubrick refuse to bury him by that Form prescribed in our Liturgy, because by the Canons of the Church he is under the Sentence of Excommunication. By the same Rule as he denies Christian Burial to the Carcasses of the dead Sinner, he may deny Christian Communion to

*Disc. of the Canons;
Ch. Unity,
p. 103.*

a Living Offender, yea, cast him out of it. ' This Authority, as he adds, is ' expressly allow'd the Minister, in ' repelling those from the Communion of the ' *Lord's Supper*, who are *notorious* and ' *open evil Livers*; and the same Reason holds in the Office of Burial. Let him, if he be able, reconcile this with the 68th Canon. However, it holds in the Case of a living Man's being *notoriously* guilty of any Offence against the Canons; Seeing, by the 27th Canon, the Minister is forbidden, under pain of *Suspension*, to give the Sacrament to any such who are there called *Schismatics*; i. e. to the whole Race of Non-conformists. And by Canon the 110th, all *Schismatics* (now Hinderers of the Execution of their *Constitutions* are there so called) are order'd to be presented in order to *Excommunication*. Thus has the Church of England thrust us out of Doors, and forbid any, under severe Penalties, to take us in; pointed her Canon ready charg'd against us, and (if the Doctor may be believ'd) put a lighted Match into the hands of every Presbyter of hers, to fire it upon us at his Pleasure for these *Offences*, as she esteems 'em, tho' We have other *thoughts* of 'em; and yet they call us all to naught for not entring in. This I must

must needs say is very Hard. And I desire to know *who* is the Schismatick ?

4thly, I urge the State of Church Discipline among 'em. The Loss of this has been acknowledged for above a Hundred Years in their *Ass-Wednesday* Service, and the horrible Corruptions of their Ecclesiastical Courts would fill a Volume. One of their own great Authors says,

Case of
the Regale
p. 166.

'Tis lost, and will not be permitted by the State. Where then, say I, is the *Authority and Jurisdiction* of this National Church, about which sometimes they talk so big ? ' Especially seeing the State, ' as he goes on, by vertue of *Conge d'estires, Quare Impeditis, Prohibitions,* ' &c. have made themselves the sole and ' ultimate Judges, not only of all Bishops and Churches: But of their Excommunications, and of their Spiritual Jurisdiction. Yea an Action lies against the Minister who shall refuse the ' *Sacrament* to them, *who he knows,* sees ' and hears in their Conversation and ' Principles to be never so much unqualified.

Id. p. 65.

This is the
last of
those that
are so
pag'd.

Now this is a Matter of great moment : For without Discipline the Church can't stand, nor exert that Commission which was given to her by Christ.

To

To pass by some four Passages on this Head, he reflects on his Brethren, that for want of ' Trust to Christ, and Faith
 ' in his Promises, they fear to execute
 ' the Commission He has given to'em.
 ' ——— for the Good of the Souls of
 ' Men: And without doing of which
 ' they *know*, they *confess*, that they cannot
 ' discharge that great Trust as they
 ' ought to do, nor be true to their *Ma-*
 ' *ster*, nor to the *Souls* committed to their
 ' Charge, many of whom they see run
 ' Head-long every Day to all Destruction
 ' on and Perdition, for want of that
 ' Discipline which they dare not execute.
 ' Our People therefore do wisely
 ' to look out after better Shepherds than
 ' these, who as he goes on, ' Only content
 ' themselves to Wish every *Ass-*
 ' *Wednesday* that it were Restor'd: Send
 ' one poor longing *Wish* after it once a
 ' Year, but move neither Hand nor Foot
 ' towards it, for fear of displeasing him
 ' whom they have chosen *King* and
 ' Head of the Church; not *next and*
 ' *immediately under*, but in the *stead of*
 ' *Christ*: For such *they have* made him,
 ' if they think he can *dispense* with, and
 ' over-rule that Discipline which Christ
 ' has left in His Church, and which is
 ' absolutely necessary, which Christ our
 ' Lord

‘ Lord thought so for the good Govern-
 ‘ ment of His Church. I shall trust my
 Reader with applying all this to our
 Defence ; and a great deal more he may
 find to this Purpose in the same Author.
 Only I must say, some of these Expres-
 sions seem to carry in ’em a very Unjust,
 as well as Malignant Reflection upon our
 present Sovereign, a Prince who has
 shew’d himself so very desirous to pro-
 mote a Reformation among the Clergy,
 as well as the People: For whereas he
 tells us, *the Church and State blame each
 other about this* ; ’tis well known his pre-
 sent Majesty gave a Commission to 30
 Divines, to prepare *Alterations as to the
 particular Forms of their Worship, Rites,
 and Ceremonies, reforming their Canons,
 and the Defects and Abuses in the Ecclesia-
 stical Courts and Jurisdictions* ; yet all was
 blown away by our Church Representative
 with a *Nolumus mutare Leges Angliæ* ; so
 was that Noble Saying of our Barons
 abused and misapplied.

Now we urge, not barely the Want or
 grievous Corruption of Discipline, but
 their Resolute *Opposition* to it. We are
 the Posterity of those, who for above a
 Hundred Years have Pray’d, Wrote, and
 Suffered for a Reformation, which the
 prevailing Party of the Inferior Clergy
 have

have obstructed, and still do so. Did we continue as fixed Members of their Church, they would be hardened, settle upon their Lees; the return would be *omnia bene*. And we judge we should *sinfully* betray and give up what our Fathers thought (and so do we) is worth contending for.

The C L O S E.

THUS have I given my *Reasons* that justify us from the *Charge of Schism*. Those which I have produced, are *Common Grounds* in which all *Dissenters* agree. For I did not think it fit to urge any about which we differ among our selves. Three things more shall conclude this Discourse.

I. Whereas 'tis plausibly said, If the Terms of Communion are *not sinful*, they who do not Communicate with a *Church* are *Schismatics*: This Position must have some Limitations: *Viz.* Provided it be a Church wherewith I am *bound* to hold Communion; and that there is not a Better to be had; and the Ministry and Worship in it are fitted to Edification; and

and that it be not *Sinful* on any other *Account* to joyn with it. This last Limitation our Brethren themselves, I believe, will not oppose. Else why do they not joyn in *Communion* with Us? What *Sinful Terms* do We require of any?

2. If our Brethren urge us too hard with this, that *Partial* and *Occasional Communion* with Them is Lawful; therefore Total and Constant Communion with them is a Duty: Let us invert the Argument, and see how it will look then; Total and Constant Communion with them is a Sin; and therefore so is a *Partial* and *Occasional* One. This later Consequence being false; therefore so is the former too.

3. That one can hardly think, how warmly soever they write when they are in a Heat, that when they are Cool, they do Believe Themselves. Do they indeed think we are Schismatics; and in a State of Damnation? Why do they not remove those Stones which they have needlessly laid; and at which we stumble and fall into Perdition? Why do they so very seldom, if ever, signify their hearty Desires, that others may remove 'em if they themselves can't? Why do they write against

gainst those who have pleaded for some Abatements in our Favour? As Dr. *Sherlock* has done against the *Protestant Reconciler*, and the *Conformists Plea for the Nonconformists*? Are not our Souls worth more than their Indifferent Ceremonies, and many of their Canons? If indeed they believe that we are in such Danger, and will not remove what they can take away, and their Church not be one whit the *Worse*, but the *Better*, that we may not thro' their Uncharitableness tumble into Eternal Fire; I must say, There's too much Reason for the Distinction of *Spirits*, which Dr. *Hickman* has made.

F I N I S.

BOOKS Written by Mr. Nath. Taylor.

A Preservative against *Deism*; shewing the Great Advantage of Revelation above Reason, &c. With an Appendix in Answer to a Letter of *A. W.* against Revealed Religion, in the Oracles of Reason.

A Discourse of the Nature and Necessity of Faith in *Jesus Christ*; with an Answer to the Arguments of our Modern *Socinians* for the Sufficiency of bare Morality, or meer Charity to Salvation,

A Sermon before the Lord Mayor Anno 1688.

A Sermon at the Funeral of Mr. Nath. Vincent.

A Sermon at the Funeral of the Reverend Mr. Rich. Mayo.

A Sermon at the Funeral of John Lane, Esq; and the Lady Mary Lane.

Printed for J. Lawrence and T. Cockerill.

BOOKS Printed for John Lawrence, at the Angel in the Poultry.

MR. Pool's English Annotations on the whole Bible, wherein the Sacred Text is inserted, together with the Various Readings, and Parallel Scriptures, &c. in 2 Vol. Fol.

The Works of the late Reverend Mr. Stephen Charnock, in 2 Vol. Fol.

The Life of the Reverend Mr. Richard Baxter, with the History of the Times he lived in; written by himself. Folio.

A Discourse of Schism: Design'd for the Satisfaction of Conscientious and Peaceable Dissenters. Quarto.

An Abridgment of the Life of the Reverend Mr. Baxter, with a History of Nonconformity from the Year 1660, by Edmund Calamy. Octavo.

Catholicism without Popery: An Essay to render the Church of England a Means and Pattern of Union to the Christian World. Octavo.

Thomas against Bennet: Or, The Protestant Dissenters vindicated from the Charge of Schism. In a Letter from a Fellow of St. John's Colledge in Cambridge, to the Rector of St. James's in Colchester.

Mr. Shower, Mr. Williams, Mr. Alsop, Mr. Calamy, and Mr. Pomfrey's Sermons before the Societies for Reformation of Manners. In Octavo.

at
of
7,
.